



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2010

No. 151

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of history and present in our day, help this Congress to move forward in hope. Each new day in this land of freedom is an opportunity for Your people to venture forth, alone or connected to others, into the vast horizon of the future.

Relying on Your hope, give to Your people vision in place of confusion, and confirmation of noble ideas and good judgment. Help the representatives of Your people to work for the common good, with discerning eyes, contemplative listening, and reasoned decisions.

May they lead this Nation to be people of faith by being attentive to Your commands, to become Your instrument and accomplish Your holy will, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1421. An act to amend section 42 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation and shipment of certain species of carp.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minutes on each side of the aisle.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, if this Congress does not act on unemployment benefits today, we risk gambling away those critical benefits for millions of men and women across the country. This couldn't come at a worse time.

Just weeks before Christmas, with winter settling in, thousands of people in my State of Maine will see their benefits run out. Although our economy has shown some signs of improving, far, far too many people are still unable to find a job.

Not only are unemployment benefits an essential part of the safety net, they are critical to keeping the local economy moving. When an unemployed Mainer gets a benefit check, he or she turns around and spends that money in the local community, at the supermarket or the gas station or the hardware store. In fact, every \$1 of unemployment benefits generates \$2 in local economic activity, according to the Department of Labor.

Madam Speaker, for the sake of out-of-work Americans and businesses

across this country, I urge my colleagues in the House to come together and extend unemployment benefits so we can keep our economy moving.

LEADERSHIP ELECTIONS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on November 2nd, the American people amplified their voices to command a new way forward. They were tired of lawmakers strangling them with Big Government regulations instead of creating much-needed jobs, and they were tired of excessive borrowing and spending.

Yesterday, the Republican Conference listened to the concerns of Americans and selected leaders who will transform the way business is done in Washington. I believe our team, led by JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR, will curb spending, create jobs, and promote opportunities to keep money in the pockets of hardworking taxpayers.

I was particularly thrilled with the election of South Carolina's Tim Scott—from my birthplace of Charleston—to the leadership team. Congressman-elect Scott's business background and proven record of bringing jobs to South Carolina is a great addition to the new Republican leadership. I look forward to working with him to promote limited government and expanded freedom.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7551

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, today this House will take up the question of whether we should extend the temporary unemployment insurance programs currently in place. If this House chooses not to do that, 2 million Americans will go into the holidays wondering not whether they will just have a holiday meal, but whether they will have a meal at all.

But let's set aside what is probably the most important thing that each and every one of us should think about, which is those people and how the holidays will look for them. Let's talk history for a second.

The fact is that the Congress of the United States has never cut unemployment insurance benefits when unemployment was anywhere near where it is today. In fact, following the 2001 recession, the Republican-controlled Congress maintained temporary unemployment insurance until the unemployment rate fell below 6 percent, well below where we are today.

Let's do something else. Let's talk economics. Every Member of this House knows that the most important thing we can do right now is to help this economy recover: Jobs.

Financial institutions that look at this stuff tell us that if we allow unemployment insurance to go away, it will have a profoundly negative effect on the economy; a number of banks estimate half a percentage point of GDP. We must renew unemployment benefits.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of American manufacturing. The Make It In America agenda creates jobs in America, reversing the flow of jobs overseas, and rebuilding the manufacturing base in America, providing good jobs for hardworking Americans.

Back home in St. Louis, I had the chance to visit with Lunar Tool, a small business in my district. They shared with me their concerns about the future of manufacturing and that with the right incentives and a level playing field, they can compete with anyone, anywhere. That is what we were sent here to do, to help rebuild our economy, including American manufacturing.

I have and will remain committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give small business and manufacturing the resources they need to rebuild this economy and put Americans back to work.

According to the Alliance for American Manufacturing, every manufacturing job supports four additional jobs in other industries. Now is not the time to stall. We must tap American innovation, that spirit that helped make this country great, to get Ameri-

cans back to work and make things in America.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Six months ago, I said the three most important issues in this country are jobs, jobs, jobs, and I said it 6 months before that. I say it now. But while we are working to restore our economy and put people back to work, we must extend unemployment benefits to the millions of Americans, our fellow citizens, who, through no fault of their own, find themselves unemployed.

In my congressional district of Las Vegas in the State of Nevada, we have been particularly hard hit. People, through no fault of their own, they're not spoiled, they're not lazy, they've worked every day of their lives. They've got no job because the economy is so bad. These are the people, our fellow citizens, our next-door neighbors, our family members that we need to help by extending unemployment benefits.

If we do not do this today, 27,000 Nevada families will have no way to put food on their families' tables. Their children will do without. They will not be able to pay their rent or put food on the table.

We have an obligation to our fellow citizens that we must help them until we get this economy back where it needs to be.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the need to immediately extend unemployment benefits and to make permanent the middle class tax cuts.

To the 14,600 Marylanders and 2 million Americans across the country who are facing the loss of their unemployment benefits, this Member of Congress and Members on this side of the aisle understand who you are and understand what you're facing.

I've stood in an unemployment line. I wasn't lazy, I wasn't not looking for a job, but I needed unemployment benefits. I've stood in a food pantry, and it's humiliating, the entire experience. And so the idea that we are going to allow Americans, hardworking American families who have earned their benefits, to go home at Thanksgiving and not know whether they're going to put a turkey on the table to feed their families, we should be ashamed if we allow that to happen.

I know that I am committed, my colleagues are committed, to make sure

that the American public understands that you need your unemployment benefits and that you want to work, and that you have worked before and that you want to work again.

And so I would say to all of those out there who would choose to not allow Americans to put food on their tables to ask themselves who we are as a country.

□ 1010

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, as we continue to work our way out of the recession with the help of economic incentives that create jobs and lay the foundation for long-term growth, one of the most important tools is the Make It In America program.

Make It In America creates jobs in America, will help reverse the flow of jobs overseas, and will help rebuild the manufacturing base in America, providing good paying jobs for hardworking Americans. It will also help America lead the world economy in the years ahead.

By creating a national manufacturing strategy, we will ensure a new prosperity by promoting American competitiveness and innovation. We are looking to building a strong 21st century clean-energy economy that will make Americans more secure.

Let's make it in America.

LARGE TAX INCREASES

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, politicians like to talk about cutting deficits. President Obama and his fellow Democrats seem to think tax increases are the only way to lower the deficit. Earlier this year, the President released a budget that called for \$1.8 trillion in tax increases.

In fact, since President Obama took office, Democrats have raised taxes by over \$670 billion and have used nearly all of it to increase the size of government, not reduce the size of deficits. During the same 22 months, the Federal Government has spent \$6.1 trillion.

But now Democrats are about to hand the American taxpayers the largest tax increase in our Nation's history. And House Republicans are determined to stop it. Congress should permanently extend the tax relief for all taxpayers.

Higher taxes are not the way to lower deficits. Washington must cut spending.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF ALONZO R. PENA

(Mr. CUELLAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Alonzo R. Pena, Deputy Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which is the ICE, in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. He has worked to make our communities safe through law enforcement for over two decades.

Mr. Pena is a native of Falfurrias, Texas, where he began his career as a Texas State trooper. In 1984, he entered the Federal service as part of the ATF in California. After several years, he returned back to Texas and worked his way up to Assistant Director for the Smuggling Division. Mr. Pena also served as the ICE Special Agent-in-Charge in San Antonio, Houston, and Phoenix.

He played a key role in the creation of the ICE's Border Enforcement Security Task Force (BEST) initiative, which developed a comprehensive approach to combat cross-border crime and which started there in my hometown of Laredo.

Deputy Director Pena has led efforts to foster increased counternarcotics and law enforcement cooperation with Mexico as the State Department's senior diplomat to the Government of Mexico at the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City.

As the current Deputy Director of ICE, Mr. Pena has assisted intelligence-driven investigations through the assistance of and relationships with Federal, State, local, and international partners.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize the unique dedication, commitment, and leadership of ICE Deputy Director Alonzo Pena, and his family.

THANKSGIVING WISHES

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have a series of Thanksgiving wishes, wishes that many in this country will provide the opportunity to extend unemployment benefits, but because of the stalling and the delay of those opposition kings and queens, we may not extend unemployment benefits so that many of the vulnerable in this country will have an opportunity to be thankful and to sit with their families and be able to celebrate.

These are hardworking Americans who have given their best to this country. How dare we not provide an extension of unemployment benefits? We must do it now.

I heard this morning someone indicate, what are we doing for small businesses? I don't know why our information does not translate to all of you hardworking small businesses. But we have given you in this Congress with this Democratic majority 16 tax cuts that you will be able to utilize and \$30 billion right now in the banks of America for you to access credit because we believe in you. You are the job creator.

Then my wishes for the City Wide Clubs in Houston, Texas, to be able to feed the 25,000 that are needing to be fed in Houston this Thanksgiving. They need help and they need to have resources.

REPUBLICANS ARE HOLDING THE MIDDLE CLASS HOSTAGE

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I urge our Republican colleagues to join us in doing the right thing for working families in this difficult time on unemployment. I've heard them say, well, we just can't afford this. Well, that's a little interesting to me when they say we can afford to blow a \$700 billion hole in the Federal deficit by giving away tax cuts to millionaires.

We Democrats stand for working middle class folks to give them middle class tax relief but not grow the Federal deficit another \$700 billion.

Now what is going on here is a hostage-taking situation, because the Republicans are holding the middle class hostage by not allowing 100 percent of Americans to have tax relief just so their friends who might be hedge fund managers or otherwise can get additional tax relief on top of it. Well, here is what we should say: Americans do not negotiate with hostage-takers.

We ought to have the right economic policy. And I'll tell you what: We are not going to allow the trickle-down economics of George Bush to be foisted on America anymore.

THE ORIGIN OF THE DEFICIT

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I think as we look at this lame duck session at the end of the 111th Congress, how we got where we are with the deficit, which was such a big issue—in 1994, Congress and President Clinton passed a bill to balance the budget, all Democrats. The result of it was the Democrats suffered a great election defeat in 1994. The Republicans took over with Newt Gingrich and had the House for the next 12 years. But we balanced the budget with a budget surplus by the year 2000.

Then President Bush came in office, and he gave these tax cuts away to a trillion-dollar war in Iraq, a war in Afghanistan, and passed Medicare part D, the largest extension of Federal benefits ever, tremendous deficit, increasing much more so than any health care bill passed since or the one that we passed, and we got this tremendous deficit.

Now the Republicans talk about earmarks. Earmarks have nothing to do with the deficit at all. It has to do with tough decisions to increase revenues or

cut spending; \$700 billion cuts to the richest isn't the way to do it. You've got to look at the Fed and other areas and be brave.

□ 1020

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1722, TELEWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2010, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1721 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1721

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1722) to require the head of each executive agency to establish and implement a policy under which employees shall be authorized to telework, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of November 19, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1721.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1721 provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act of 2010. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the Senate amendment shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule allows the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules through the legislative day of November 19, 2010. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

This is the third time this year that the House has debated and considered this bill. Each of the previous two times, a majority of the Members voted for the bill.

I have often heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak eloquently of how much more efficient the private sector is and about the need for government to take more cues from business. Telecommuting could not be a better example of this. There is no reason that the Federal Government should not make full use of the perpetual advances being made in mobile technologies to ensure that our government's workforce functions as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible.

Telework policies are even more important during times of emergency. The Office of Management and Budget, OMB, has estimated that for each day the Federal Government was shut down during the mega-snowstorms that hit the Capital Region last February, we lost \$71 million worth of productivity. It is important to point out that OMB also concluded that without employees at some agencies being able to telecommute, the cost of lost productivity would have been easily beyond \$100 million.

The Telework Improvements Act will provide a framework to expand the current telecommuting program so that all Federal employees can take advantage of these opportunities.

□ 1030

Telecommuting also helps to reduce traffic congestion. Not only does this save gas and emissions, but it decreases rush-hour traffic for all residents of the D.C. metro area, whether they work for the Federal Government or in the private sector.

In the past, some have argued that telecommuting just allows lazy government employees to sit at home and pretend to work. That's simply not the case. This bill requires agencies to establish a telecommuting policy that authorizes employees to telecommute to the maximum amount possible only to the extent that it doesn't diminish employee performance or agency operations.

The Senate amendments to H.R. 1722 also require agencies to maintain a telework database for various research

and reporting requirements, including a confidential hotline and email address to report abuses, and require agencies to submit a summary of abuse reports to the Government Accountability Office, the GAO. These measures will ensure that telecommuting workers are efficient and accountable.

I urge all Members to support the rule and the Senate amendments to H.R. 1722, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, if a tree falls in the forest and there is no one there to hear it, does it still make a sound?

After their thorough drubbing on Election Day, it makes sense for the Democrats to revisit this metaphysical question. Despite the abundance of evidence and warnings from pollsters, from authorities across the political spectrum and from the American people, the liberals maintain their losses were due to miscommunication and voter ignorance, all resulting from the sour economy and nothing more.

They refuse to acknowledge the reality that voters rejected the liberals' government takeover of health care and the process that accompanied its passage. They refuse to recognize that their endless bailouts of megabanks, automobile manufacturers and unions could have possibly led to the historical election results. Stubbornly clinging to their failed prescription of bigger government and ever-increasing taxes, the liberals continue to defend the stimulus and their extravagant spending as cornerstones of their futile efforts at healing the economy.

So perhaps the question should now become: If American voters roundly reject the failed liberal agenda, will any Democrats notice? By continuing to spend hard-earned taxpayer money in an irresponsible fashion, it appears obvious that the answer is "no."

Republicans have been listening to the American people and warning the ruling liberal Democrats of the consequences of their Big Government overreach. However, those who think of themselves as liberal elites in Washington seem to have been the only ones in the country to have missed the writing on the wall and the message of November 2. The ruling Democrat regime ignored the clear evidence of voter discontent, and they continue their march lockstep with a liberal agenda which would embarrass many European states.

Their minions blindly followed further expanding government with nearly every bill they passed. Then, on November 2, the voters showed their feelings by removing the gavel from the grip of San Francisco liberal NANCY PELOSI. The liberals' response to an election of such historic proportions: Blame voter ignorance and the marginalized minority congressional Republicans. Voters rejected uncon-

scionable spending and deficit increases. They rejected a government takeover of health care. They rejected the Federal ownership of any industry deemed too incompetent to fail, but they also rejected the heavy handed, autocratic rule of congressional liberals.

If we accept as truth liberal claims that unemployment is the exclusive issue of concern to all voters, one must wonder what the liberals plan to do about the stalled economy now that the voters have forced them to refocus.

The answer to reducing the unemployment rate: Pass flawed legislation that makes it easier for Federal employees to stay at home and get paid for work.

There it is, folks. The liberal Democrat elites have found the solution that has evaded them for so long. It is not to keep tax rates for small businesses from rising. It is not to look at ways to cut spending so that more capital is available to the private sector. It is not pushing for improved trade agreements that will increase exports and help restore our balance of trade. It is not to shrink the size and number of Federal regulations that are slowing job creation in the private sector.

No. Madam Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, they bring us an opportunity to reinvigorate America's strength by spending \$30 million more to make it easier for Federal employees to work from home.

On September 30, 2010, the Senate passed H.R. 1722 with an amendment—adopted by unanimous consent—stripping out almost all of the provisions added to the bill by the House under a successful motion to recommit offered by Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member ISSA. The bipartisan House MTR provisions that were stripped out by the Senate are provisions which would:

require each agency to certify that the telework program will save money before authorizing any employees to telework; prohibit employees from engaging in any union or collective bargaining activities while teleworking; require employees of the executive office of the President to carbon copy their official email accounts on any official business communications that are made on personal email and social media accounts; make employees ineligible for telework if they have fraudulently applied for and received low-income home energy assistance payments for which they are ineligible or have seriously delinquent tax debts.

The removal of these provisions by the Senate will raise the cost of this legislation and will provide a teleworking benefit to individuals who clearly should not be entrusted with increased latitude and autonomy. Absent these provisions, telework becomes another perk for Federal workers whose salaries and other compensation already surpass those of their private sector counterparts.

The American people have grown tired of waiting for real solutions to

their problems. Fortunately, help is on the way. In January, this House will set a new course towards protecting individual liberties and shrinking the unending expansion of the suffocating Federal bureaucracy. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I guess, after the last election, I had naively thought that we could come back and get away from the political sniping and focus on governing, but it sounds like that is not the case, and that's unfortunate.

This was a bill that was passed in the House with strong bipartisan support. It certainly was not anything that was political but was something that was needed and necessary. Unfortunately, I think that we are going to continue to hear about politics rather than about governing.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill as I appreciate his insightful comments about where we are and where we are going.

Madam Speaker, I, too, listened to what was not a debate on this bill but a continuation of the political rhetoric that the American public has enjoyed over the course of the last 3 or 4 months. Actually, I don't know that they enjoyed it, as the people I heard from back home actually got rather tired of it.

It was ironic that I heard my good friend Ms. FOXX talking about the government takeover of health care after I had just been visited by representatives of one of the largest health insurance companies in America, who was talking about their role in health care reform. They saw it as making a path towards better health care and that they'd have to do some things differently but that they were working on the implementation of it. I met with these representatives back home after the election. I met with a wide variety of people from health care, who were talking about how we move forward in this partnership that has been focused and in terms of how we improve Medicare for our seniors.

The notion that somehow this is a takeover is lost on the people who are actually in the health care arena, and the American public will find that out. We will be able to hear their suggestions going forward.

With regard to the notion of the failed stimulus, I just left a group of eight large corporate representatives, who were talking about moving forward on some of the infrastructure and energy items that were important to them. Yesterday, a dozen energy executives who thought it was important, as well as creating and saving jobs. The disconnect between the political rhetoric and what any American can verify by talking to the health care busi-

nesses that are involved will show that it's rather hollow.

□ 1040

But that is why the legislation before us got bogged down, because there were extraneous provisions in it that looked good in a sound byte but actually had little to do with the legislation. For instance, the provision that would have required denial of the ability to telecommute to people who were delinquent in their taxes was actually unenforceable. There was no way that the IRS could do what they wanted to do, and so they were willing to deny the ability of the Federal Government to be able to have the efficiencies that people back home in Oregon have with telecommunication in the private sector, rather they would continue to bog it down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We in Congress can telecommute. It makes me available to be able to work 7 days a week whether I'm in Washington, D.C., or I'm in Portland. Our staff does it routinely, but they would deny the ability of Federal employees.

This is, as my friend from New York pointed out, bipartisan legislation. It's always had Republicans and Democrats supporting it. It's received strong majorities. I'm sure it will pass today. But I'm hopeful that we can focus on the business at hand, not hang up important work.

I want to make sure that any Federal employee who is delinquent in their taxes pays up. I'm happy to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle to focus specific legislation in that regard, and as a member of Ways and Means, I'm happy to work with them to do that. But for heaven's sake, let's deal with important things here, perhaps not repeat all the political talking points. Let's get down to some serious business.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just point out to my colleague from Oregon that telework already exists. Federal employees can do it already. What this bill does is allocate \$30 million and create more bureaucracy. We're not stopping telework. We're not creating telework. We're expanding it and spending more money.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question and in support of this week's YouCut item, the elimination of taxpayer subsidies to National Public Radio.

National Public Radio's recent firing of longtime news analyst Juan Williams was a wake-up call for many Americans to political correctness and liberal bias at NPR. However, it's not the liberal bias that offends me so much as that American citizens are

forced to subsidize it with their hard-earned tax dollars.

Long before the Juan Williams fiasco, I sponsored legislation to pull the plug on taxpayer funding for NPR. I enjoy some programs on NPR, but I have long believed that it can stand on its own.

The question is not the quality of programming on NPR. The question today is whether government programs and services that can be funded privately should be subsidized by taxpayers. As a country, we no longer have this luxury, if we ever did. With the national debt over \$13 trillion, the government simply can't afford to continue funding nonessential services.

Americans voted through the popular Web site YouCut to place this proposal on the House floor for a vote today. The selection of this measure shows the American people desire to rein in unnecessary spending. My proposal would prohibit Federal dollars from going to NPR through any of the various Federal grants they now access. I myself enjoy NPR programming, but why should Americans foot the bill for this when we have to borrow about 40 cents on every Federal dollar?

NPR local radio stations directly receive congressionally appropriated funds that reached over \$65 million in 2010 alone. Plus, local stations directly receive grants from other Federal sources such as the National Endowment for the Arts. NPR stations then use these taxpayer dollars on licensing fees for NPR programming, which are then funneled back to NPR headquarters here in Washington, DC. Taking this indirect funding into account, Federal funds now make up an estimated 20 percent of NPR's annual budget.

Let me be clear, this measure will not prohibit local stations from receiving any other funding. It will just prohibit them from using taxpayer money to acquire NPR programming.

Unsustainable Federal spending is a serious threat to the United States economy and to the future prosperity of the American people. Americans know this. We shouldn't wait until the 112th Congress to start solving this problem. Cutting spending begins now. We must begin the hard work of eliminating these deficits and creating jobs by making tough choices on spending today.

The American people have asked Congress to put a stop to out-of-control spending. Millions of them have voted through YouCut that prohibiting Federal funding of NPR is a good place to start. I urge my colleagues to heed the will of the American people to get Federal spending under control and vote for a sensible reduction of spending by opposing the previous question.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

I was on my way out of the Chamber and I heard my friend from Colorado

talk about attacking out-of-control Federal spending by making sure that there's no direct or indirect ability for resources from the Federal Government to go to NPR. Madam Speaker, I find that really a sad reflection on the current state of affairs.

National public broadcasting is one of the few areas where the American public can actually get balanced information. It's not the bloviators on the right or the left. Public broadcasting, because it is not taking commercial advertising, because it has a commitment to public service and balanced information, has been the most important, unbiased source available to Americans from coast to coast.

The Federal investment in public broadcasting is relatively minor. It is 10, 15 percent, when you add everything up, but it is an important portion because it leverages vast amounts of money that otherwise would not be available.

I, like my friend from Colorado, participate. I go to the telethons. I contribute every year from my family, and I'm glad to do it. You know, but if this agenda, which is where the Republicans who took over last time were trying to go, to defund public broadcasting, is picked up even before they take control is successful, it's going to have very serious consequences. It's not going to affect Denver. It's not going to affect Portland, Oregon, or San Francisco or New York except that the quality of some of the programs will erode, frankly, because these are tough times and sponsorship from the business community is down and individuals are having to stretch to be able to contribute. These services are more important than ever, when we've got all these screaming heads on the air giving forth information that is hardly balanced and accurate.

But what will happen? Not only the erosion of quality and some of the programs for culture and education that are not going to have a commercial base will be eroded. What is going to have the biggest impact, if they have their way, will be the areas of America that don't have the population base. Rural and small town America will pay the price.

Oregon public broadcasting is one of the finest public broadcasting systems in the United States, but the most expensive persons to serve are the people in the far reaches of our State, where we put up expensive translators to be able to get the programming out there. We have programming that is designed to reach to the furthest extent of our State, and that is subsidized. If we are going to lose the modest amount of Federal subsidization, it will not only affect the quality in Denver and Portland and Charlotte, in Atlanta, in Ithaca, but it's going to make it harder for rural and small town America to be able to get this vital service.

□ 1050

You look at the costs that they bear, that will be an area that will suffer the

cuts if we're not able to maintain funding. I think that's a tragedy. I think it is a tragedy to try to politicize NPR.

I'm not going to comment on the handling of the Juan Williams episode. There are others that have talked about it endlessly. The head of NPR indicated she would have handled it differently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. When you mix NPR and FOX News and you go back and deconstruct that, they have rules of journalism that they follow, that people are supposed to follow, and Mr. Williams had trouble following those rules before.

But notwithstanding that, the point is we need to have the public in public broadcasting. The Federal minuscule dollars that are invested in that compared to the amount of money that is wasted in defense, in agriculture subsidy pales by comparison. And I think we are going to be able to work with some of the new Members of Congress to deal with things that have defied reform in the past. I am looking forward to some of what they say.

But public broadcasting is a resource, is a treasure for Americans from coast to coast. It is trusted by more Americans than any other resource in terms of the news, and it is far more than just news. It is education. It is culture. It is history. And it would be a tragedy to eat away at NPR to make it harder to serve the difficult-to-reach areas of our country.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, our colleague from Oregon has just given us another example of how out of touch our colleagues across the aisle are. If he thinks that public radio is balanced and unbiased and our taking away that funding will have serious consequences, he is obviously not in touch with the American people. Republicans are in touch with the American people. That's why we're making this proposal. I live in a rural area, and I understand that.

Again, you're blaming the victim. You're blaming the voters. Please, don't blame the voters. That's not what they're looking for.

I now would like to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, folks back home in Kansas have been forced to tighten their belts and rein in family budgets to weather tough times, and we don't understand why Washington isn't willing to do the same. The Federal Government should have only a few foundational duties. Among those are protecting our citizens, maintaining a strong infrastructure, and upholding our rights as outlined in the Constitution. Notably missing from this list is the funding of political radio shows, particularly those that operate with a litmus test.

The Federal Government is leaking money left and right, and it's time to

plug some holes. Today's YouCut proposal will save the American taxpayers over \$100 million and will be proof that Congress is ready to shrink the size and scope of the Federal Government.

I urge your support. Please oppose the previous question.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to remind my colleagues about the true purpose of this bill, which is to make sure that the Federal Government is taking the steps necessary to increase its ability to function, even in times of national emergencies, because that is what we are here in Congress to do—to make sure that the government continues to function, especially in times of national emergencies.

The bill requires Federal agencies to implement policies and practices to allow employees to telecommute. It requires them to train their employees about how to do their work remotely so that the Federal employees can continue to do their jobs, even if they can't get to work because of a natural disaster or other emergency.

There has been some discussion about the need to police telecommuting employees, so I want to talk about some of the oversight and accountability measures that this legislation contains.

This bill requires the Office of Personnel Management to provide teleworking assistance and guidance to agencies, to maintain a telework database, and to establish various research and reporting requirements.

The bill sets up a confidential hotline and email address to report abuses and requires the OPM to report to the Government Accountability Office about any abuse reports it receives.

Finally, the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722 also requires OPM to consult with the National Archives about how to manage and preserve all records from telework, including Presidential and Vice Presidential records, something that was raised by the Republicans in their motion to recommit back in July.

So, you see that there are oversight measures built into these telework policies. This bill doesn't just say to agencies, "Send your employees home." No. It directs the Federal agencies to set up policies and trainings so that their employees know how to work just as efficiently outside the office as they can at their desks in times of emergency, and those employees know that there is oversight by the agency of the work that is being done.

Those protections are included in this bill, just as they are in the telework policies used by companies in the private sector. That is why this bill makes common sense, because the Federal Government should be adopting policies like this that are commonly used in the private sector to make sure that our government functions efficiently and effectively, even during emergencies that prevent employees from coming into the office.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, before we took our recess to be at home for the elections, every bill that was brought here was about jobs. That didn't work, obviously, because our unemployment rate is still very high. Now, are we to believe that all the bills are going to be about national security? I hope that Osama bin Laden has been put on notice: This is going to improve our national security, and he'd better watch out.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill here spends \$30 million to create additional opportunities for Federal employees to work at home. The American people are suffering because of our unemployment rate. Because of the failed policies of this Congress and this administration, the American people are learning to do more with less. Why can't Federal employees learn to do that? They are soon going to have to do that.

This is a travesty, to come here with our economy in the situation that it's in and say, We're going to appropriate \$30 million more in order for Federal employees to stay at home. H.R. 1722 requires each Federal agency to create a teleworking managing officer, even though some agencies may not be big enough to warrant such a position.

So, again, the Democrats' answer to the 9.6 percent unemployment rate that has persisted for almost 2 years and the \$1.3 trillion deficit is to create more Federal jobs and require that some of those Federal Government workers be allowed to work from home. Give me a break. The nearly 4 million Americans—3.811 million—who have lost their jobs since President Obama took office and over 6 million who have lost their jobs since NANCY PELOSI became Speaker in January 2007 continue to ask where are the jobs that they were promised.

The Congress is pushing this initiative to make it easier for Federal employees, who already have it much better than the rest of the country, to avoid the office. So why is this bill so popular with the ruling liberal Democrats? Perhaps it has something to do with their longstanding subservience to labor unions. According to the latest figures available on OpenSecrets.org, big labor donated \$49,710,561, or 93 percent of its total campaign contributions, to Democrats and \$3,444,042, or 6 percent, to Republicans in the last election cycle. Surely money like that isn't going to be wasted pushing legislation good for private sector employees.

It's true that a majority of American union members now work for the government, as 52 percent of all union members now work for the government, representing a sharp increase from the 49 percent in 2008. A full 37.4 percent of government employees belonged to unions in 2009, up 0.6 percentage points from 2008.

These changes in union membership are certainly not surprising, as unionized companies do poorly in the marketplace and lose jobs relative to their nonunion competitors. Government employees, however, face no competition as the government never goes out of business.

The recession has left union bosses looking for new membership targets, and where better to look than in government, which they see as having the deepest of all pockets and a host of sympathetic liberal Democrat politicians eager to please their political base.

□ 1100

In fact, according to the Heritage Foundation, when accounting for wages and benefits, the total average annual compensation for a private-sector worker is \$60,078, as compared to \$111,015 for the average Federal worker, representing an astonishing 85 percent compensation differential.

A March 26, 2010, Wall Street Journal editorial entitled "The Government Pay Boom" reveals that: "Nearly this entire benefits gap is accounted for by unionized public employees. Nonunion public employees are paid roughly what private workers receive."

"The union response is that government workers deserve all this because they're more educated and highly skilled. That may account for some of the pay differential, but not the blow-out benefits. The unions also neglect one of the greatest perks of government employment: job security. Short of shooting up a Post Office, government workers rarely get fired or laid off."

The Republican Study Committee released a policy brief recently indicating that the number of Federal employees making over \$100,000 has increased by almost 15 percent since 2007. Currently, there are more people in the Federal Government making in excess of \$100,000 than those making \$40,000.

Since the recession began in 2007, public worker pay has risen 7.8 percent. While private-sector wages remain stagnant, the 2010 pay increase for Federal civilian employees was 2 percent. In 2009, the average Federal employee received a pay increase of 3.9 percent, and an average pay increase of 3.5 percent in 2008.

The average Federal salary, including benefits, is set to grow from \$72,800 in 2008 to \$75,419 in 2010.

In 2007, when the Democrats took over the Congress, the Department of Transportation had only one employee making over \$170,000. At the end of last year it had 1,690 employees making that amount.

The Federal pay premium exists across all job categories, white collar, blue collar, management, professional, technical, and low skill.

Again, the public is asking, where are the jobs? Why aren't the Democrats who are in charge of the Congress doing something about private-sector

jobs instead of focusing on creating more perks for Federal employees?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, my friend from North Carolina talks about passage of this bill being a travesty. I couldn't disagree more. The travesty would be if there were a national emergency and we were ill prepared for it because of the fact that we didn't act today, because of something that we could have done that we didn't do. That would be a travesty.

Additionally, the travesty is that she talks about this in political terms, when this is about governing. The days of the politics have to end. The days of governing need to begin. That's what this bill is about. It's about working together, in a bipartisan way, to govern, to make government run more efficiently in a time when we need it most, in a time of emergency. That is the travesty, not to act on it. Not to sit here and talk about the politics of it, but rather to talk about how, together, we can make this work so that government functions better for the people that we represent.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, the issue is about spending. It is about stopping the rampant spending in Washington. And on November 2, Americans spoke decisively and sent an undeniable message to Washington to end wasteful spending.

In the new Republican majority next Congress, Madam Speaker, the YouCut program will be an integral part of our efforts to transform the culture of spending in Washington into one of savings. More than 2.4 million YouCut votes provide us with a clear mandate to rein in spending and make the tough choices to get America back on the right path.

This week's winning item, Madam Speaker, is a proposal developed by the gentleman from Colorado, Representative DOUG LAMBORN. This proposal would eliminate taxpayer funding for National Public Radio. When executives at NPR decided to unfairly terminate Juan Williams for expressing his opinion and to then disparage him afterwards, the bias of the organization was exposed.

To be clear, it is not the government's job to tell a news organization how to do its job. But what's equally as certain is that it should not be the taxpayer's responsibility to fund news organizations with a partisan point of view. Eliminating taxpayer funding for NPR is precisely the kind of common-sense cut that we have to begin making if we want to fundamentally alter the way business is conducted in Washington.

Over the past 2 years, Americans have become exasperated as they've watched the Federal Government grow

to an unacceptable level of spending, by spending record levels of money it simply doesn't have. In order to get America back to opportunity, responsibility, and success, Republicans and Democrats must come together and begin making tough choices. Today's YouCut vote is an opportunity for both parties to come together and to tell the people that have sent us here—message received.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the evidence is in. The liberal Democrat agenda has failed. They need to go back to the drawing board and come back to the American people with real solutions to their real problems. This isn't the time to dither and blame the Republican minority for the disappointing collapse of governance we've seen since the liberal majority seized control of Congress in 2007.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to force the ruling liberal Democrats to rethink their misguided proposals by rejecting this rule and underlying bill to protest the liberal agenda that continues to distract from private-sector job creation and getting the economy back on its feet.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be placed in the record prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so I can amend the rule to allow all Members of Congress the opportunity to vote to cut spending.

Republicans recently launched the YouCut initiative, which gives people an opportunity to vote for Federal spending they would like to see Congress cut. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have cast their votes, and this week they have directed their representatives in Congress to consider H.R. 5538, which is a bill that would prohibit Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the parent organization of National Public Radio, after fiscal 2012.

According to the Republican Whip's YouCut Web site, National Public Radio's recent decision to terminate commentator Juan Williams' contract because of comments he expressed on another station have brought newfound attention to NPR's receipt of taxpayer funds.

NPR receives taxpayer funding in two different ways. First, they receive direct government grants from various Federal agencies, including the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Department of Commerce, Department of Education, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Over the past 2 years, this direct funding has totaled approximately \$9 million.

But NPR also receives taxpayer funds indirectly. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting makes grants to public radio stations. While some of these grants can be used for any purpose, some can be used only to acquire and produce programming. Often this programming is purchased from NPR. Indeed, programming fees and dues paid by local public radio stations to NPR accounts for approximately 40 percent of NPR's budget, or about \$65 million last year. A portion of these funds were originally Federal tax dollars provided to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, to the local public radio stations.

NPR receives a significant amount of funding from private individuals and organizations through donations and sponsorship. For example, in 2008, NPR listed over 32 separate private donors and sponsors who provided financial support in excess of half a million dollars that year.

□ 1110

NPR officials have indicated that taxpayer funding makes up only a small portion of their overall budget. Therefore, eliminating taxpayer support should not materially affect NPR's ability to operate while at the same time saving taxpayers millions of dollars annually.

In order to provide for consideration of this commonsense legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, as I said in my opening, this is the third time this year that the House has debated and considered this bill. Each of the previous two times, a majority of members voted for the bill.

When the bill passed the House in July, the Republican motion to recommit was adopted on a bipartisan vote of 303-119. I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are greatly upset that a number of the provisions that were adopted as part of the motion to recommit were removed by the Senate. I understand your frustration. The number of worthy measures that this body has sent to the Senate during this Congress is staggering. However, we must not let that frustration prevent us from sending this bill to the President, because the version of the bill in front of us today will ensure that our government continues to function efficiently and effectively—even during times of national emergency.

For this reason, I urge all members to vote "yes," to avoid the politics, and get back to the governing that this Congress promised to do, vote "yes" on the previous question, vote "yes" on the rule, and vote "yes" on the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, this is a blatant attempt to politically interfere with the programming decision-making of America's public radio stations.

Efforts to deny funding to public broadcasting for political reasons are a violation of

America's standards of a free and independent press.

This represents a wholesale breach of local stations' ability to make local, independent decisions to meet the needs of local audiences.

Fundamentally, public broadcasting is rooted in local communities. Stations are locally licensed and governed, locally programmed and locally staffed. It is a system of local stations interconnected to enable local, regional and national program production and distribution, but committed to local service.

For more than 40 years, the federal government has provided financial support for public broadcasting—to provide essential educational, news and cultural programming that meets the local needs of American communities, large and small.

Public broadcasting is the last remaining source of independent, non-commercial, thought-provoking broadcast media in the country. In many communities, public radio is the only source of free local, national and international news and music and cultural programming. Public radio stations are located in nearly every major city and small town, delivering highly trusted, agenda-free news and information to 37 million Americans each week.

Federal funding has played an important role in assuring free and universal access to programs that inform and enrich the life of millions of Americans in every corner of the country.

Vote "yes" on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1721 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6417) to prohibit Federal funding of certain public radio programming, to provide for the transfer of certain public radio funds to reduce the public debt, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for

further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6417.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

YEAS—239

Ackerman	Garamendi	Meeks (NY)
Altmire	Gonzalez	Melancon
Andrews	Gordon (TN)	Michaud
Arcuri	Grayson	Miller (NC)
Baca	Green, Al	Miller, George
Baird	Green, Gene	Minnick
Baldwin	Grijalva	Mitchell
Barrow	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Bean	Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)
Becerra	Halvorson	Moore (WI)
Berkley	Hare	Moran (VA)
Berman	Harman	Murphy (CT)
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Murphy, Patrick
Bishop (NY)	Herseth Sandlin	Nadler (NY)
Blumenauer	Higgins	Napolitano
Boccieri	Himes	Neal (MA)
Boren	Hinchey	Nye
Boswell	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Boyd	Hirono	Obey
Brady (PA)	Hodes	Oliver
Braley (IA)	Holden	Ortiz
Brown, Corrine	Holt	Owens
Butterfield	Honda	Pallone
Capps	Inslee	Pascarell
Capuano	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Carney	(TX)	Perriello
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Chandler	Kagen	Pingree (ME)
Childers	Kanjorski	Polis (CO)
Chu	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Clarke	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kildee	Quigley
Cohen	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Connolly (VA)	Kilroy	Rangel
Conyers	Kind	Reyes
Cooper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Richardson
Costa	Kissell	Rodriguez
Costello	Klein (FL)	Ross
Courtney	Kosmas	Rothman (NJ)
Critz	Kratovil	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Langevin	Rush
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Dahlkemper	Larson (CT)	Salazar
Davis (AL)	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Levin	T.
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sarbanes
DeGette	Loebback	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Schauer
Deutch	Lowey	Schiff
Dicks	Lujan	Schrader
Dingell	Lynch	Schwartz
Doggett	Maffei	Scott (GA)
Donnelly (IN)	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Markey (CO)	Serrano
Driehaus	Markey (MA)	Sestak
Edwards (MD)	Marshall	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Matheson	Sherman
Ellsworth	Matsui	Shuler
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Sires
Eshoo	McCollum	Skelton
Etheridge	McDermott	Slaughter
Farr	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Filner	McIntyre	Snyder
Foster	McMahon	Space
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Speier
Fudge	Meek (FL)	Spratt

Stark	Tonko	Watt
Stupak	Towns	Waxman
Sutton	Tsongas	Weiner
Tanner	Velázquez	Welch
Teague	Visclosky	Wilson (OH)
Thompson (CA)	Walz	Woolsey
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman	Wu
Tierney	Schultz	Yarmuth
Titus	Watson	

NAYS—171

Aderholt	Giffords	Myrick
Adler (NJ)	Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer
Akin	Gohmert	Nunes
Alexander	Goodlatte	Olson
Austria	Granger	Paul
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Pence
Bartlett	Griffith	Petri
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Pitts
Biggert	Hall (TX)	Platts
Blibray	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Heller	Price (GA)
Blunt	Hensarling	Putnam
Boehner	Herger	Rehberg
Bonner	Hoekstra	Reichert
Bono Mack	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jones	Rooney
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Roskam
Buyer	King (NY)	Royce
Calvert	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Campbell	Lamborn	Schmidt
Cantor	Lance	Schock
Cao	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Capito	LaTourette	Sessions
Carter	Latta	Shadegg
Cassidy	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Castle	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Chaffetz	Linder	Simpson
Coble	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Coffman (CO)	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Lummis	Stearns
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel	Stutzman
Culberson	E.	Sullivan
Dent	Mack	Taylor
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Djou	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dreier	McCaul	Tiberi
Duncan	McClintock	Turner
Ehlers	McCotter	Upton
Emerson	McHenry	Walden
Flake	McKeon	Wamp
Fleming	McMorris	Westmoreland
Forbes	Rodgers	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Young (FL)
Gerlach	Murphy, Tim	

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Hill
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Hoyer
Boozman	Davis (TN)	Inglis
Boucher	Delahunt	Kirk
Bright	Edwards (TX)	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Fallin	Tiahrt
Ginny	Fattah	Van Hollen
Clay	Gallely	Waters

□ 1144

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. TSONGAS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 171, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—235

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Nye
Adler (NJ)	Grijalva	Oberstar
Altmire	Gutierrez	Obey
Andrews	Hall (NY)	Olver
Arcuri	Halvorson	Ortiz
Baca	Hare	Owens
Baird	Harman	Pallone
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Barrow	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Bean	Herse	Payne
Becerra	Herseth Sandlin	Perriello
Berkley	Higgins	Peters
Berman	Himes	Peterson
Berry	Hinchey	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Polis (CO)
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hodes	Price (NC)
Boccieri	Holden	Quigley
Boren	Holt	Rahall
Boswell	Honda	Rangel
Boyd	Inslee	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Israel	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Brown, Corrine	Jackson Lee	Ross
Butterfield	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Cardoza	Kagen	Rush
Carnahan	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Kaptur	Salazar
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kildee	T.
Chandler	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Childers	Kilroy	Sarbanes
Chu	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schauer
Cleaver	Kissell	Schiff
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Schrader
Connolly (VA)	Kosmas	Schwartz
Conyers	Kratovil	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Costa	Langevin	Serrano
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Critz	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Sires
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cummings	Lipinski	Slaughter
Dahlkemper	Loeb	Smith (WA)
Davis (AL)	Loeb	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Space
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Speier
DeFazio	Lujan	Spratt
DeGette	Lynch	Stark
DeLauro	Maffei	Stupak
Deutch	Maloney	Sutton
Dicks	Markey (CO)	Tanner
Dingell	Marshall	Teague
Djou	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN)	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Doyle	McCollum	Titus
Driehaus	McDermott	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	McGovern	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McIntyre	Tsongas
Ellison	McMahon	Velázquez
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Walz
Eshoo	Melancon	Wasserman
Etheridge	Michaud	Schultz
Farr	Miller (NC)	Watson
Finer	Miller, George	Watt
Foster	Minnick	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Mitchell	Weiner
Fudge	Mollohan	Welch
Garamendi	Moore (KS)	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Woolsey
Gordon (TN)	Moran (VA)	Yarmuth
Grayson	Murphy (CT)	
Green, Al	Murphy (NY)	
	Napolitano	
	Neal (MA)	

NOES—171

Aderholt	Alexander	Bachmann
Akin	Austria	Bachus

Bartlett	Graves (MO)	Paul
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Paulsen
Biggart	Guthrie	Pence
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bilirakis	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Blackburn	Heller	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Hensarling	Posey
Boehner	Herger	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hoekstra	Putnam
Bono Mack	Hunter	Rehberg
Boustany	Issa	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Brown (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Rooney
Buyer	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Kingston	Roskam
Camp	Kline (MN)	Royce
Campbell	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Lance	Scalise
Cao	Latham	Schmidt
Capito	LaTourette	Schock
Carter	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cassidy	Lee (NY)	Sessions
Castle	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Chaffetz	Linder	Shimkus
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo	Shuler
Cole	Lucas	Shuster
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Crenshaw	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lumgren, Daniel	Smith (NJ)
Dent	E.	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Stutzman
Dreier	Marchant	Sullivan
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Taylor
Ehlers	McCaul	Terry
Emerson	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Flake	McCotter	Thornberry
Fleming	McHenry	Tiberi
Forbes	McKeon	Turner
Fortenberry	McMorris	Upton
Fox	Rodgers	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Giffords	Moran (KS)	Wittman
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Gohmert	Myrick	Wu
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Granger	Nunes	Young (FL)
Graves (GA)	Olson	

NOT VOTING—27

Barrett (SC)	Davis (TN)	McNerney
Boozman	Delahunt	Murphy, Patrick
Boucher	Fallin	Nadler (NY)
Bright	Fattah	Perlmutter
Brown-Waite,	Galleghy	Radanovich
Ginny	Hill	Tiahrt
Clay	Hoyer	Van Hollen
Clyburn	Inglis	Waters
Coble	Kirk	
Davis (KY)	Markey (MA)	

□ (1152)

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1721, I call up the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Telework Enhancement Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. TELEWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 63 the following:

“CHAPTER 65—TELEWORK

“Sec.

“6501. Definitions.

“6502. Executive agencies telework requirement.

“6503. Training and monitoring.

“6504. Policy and support.

“6505. Telework Managing Officer.

“6506. Reports.

“§ 6501. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘employee’ has the meaning given that term under section 2105.

“(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—Except as provided in section 6506, the term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term under section 105.

“(3) TELEWORK.—The term ‘telework’ or ‘teleworking’ refers to a work flexibility arrangement under which an employee performs the duties and responsibilities of such employee’s position, and other authorized activities, from an approved worksite other than the location from which the employee would otherwise work.

“§ 6502. Executive agencies telework requirement

“(a) TELEWORK ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this chapter, the head of each executive agency shall—

“(A) establish a policy under which eligible employees of the agency may be authorized to telework;

“(B) determine the eligibility for all employees of the agency to participate in telework; and

“(C) notify all employees of the agency of their eligibility to telework.

“(2) LIMITATION.—An employee may not telework under a policy established under this section if—

“(A) the employee has been officially disciplined for being absent without permission for more than 5 days in any calendar year; or

“(B) the employee has been officially disciplined for violations of subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography, on a Federal Government computer or while performing official Federal Government duties.

“(b) PARTICIPATION.—The policy described under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) ensure that telework does not diminish employee performance or agency operations;

“(2) require a written agreement that—

“(A) is entered into between an agency manager and an employee authorized to telework, that outlines the specific work arrangement that is agreed to; and

“(B) is mandatory in order for any employee to participate in telework;

“(3) provide that an employee may not be authorized to telework if the performance of that employee does not comply with the terms of the written agreement between the agency manager and that employee;

“(4) except in emergency situations as determined by the head of an agency, not apply to any employee of the agency whose official duties require on a daily basis (every work day)—

“(A) direct handling of secure materials determined to be inappropriate for telework by the agency head; or

“(B) on-site activity that cannot be handled remotely or at an alternate worksite; and

“(5) be incorporated as part of the continuity of operations plans of the agency in the event of an emergency.

“§ 6503. Training and monitoring

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each executive agency shall ensure that—

“(1) an interactive telework training program is provided to—

“(A) employees eligible to participate in the telework program of the agency; and

“(B) all managers of teleworkers;

“(2) except as provided under subsection (b), an employee has successfully completed the interactive telework training program before that employee enters into a written agreement to telework described under section 6502(b)(2);

“(3) teleworkers and nonteleworkers are treated the same for purposes of—

“(A) periodic appraisals of job performance of employees;

“(B) training, rewarding, reassigning, promoting, reducing in grade, retaining, and removing employees;

“(C) work requirements; or

“(D) other acts involving managerial discretion; and

“(4) when determining what constitutes diminished employee performance, the agency shall consult the performance management guidelines of the Office of Personnel Management.

“(b) TRAINING REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.—The head of an executive agency may provide for an exemption from the training requirements under subsection (a), if the head of that agency determines that the training would be unnecessary because the employee is already teleworking under a work arrangement in effect before the date of enactment of this chapter.

“§ 6504. Policy and support

“(a) AGENCY CONSULTATION WITH THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—Each executive agency shall consult with the Office of Personnel Management in developing telework policies.

“(b) GUIDANCE AND CONSULTATION.—The Office of Personnel Management shall—

“(1) provide policy and policy guidance for telework in the areas of pay and leave, agency closure, performance management, official worksite, recruitment and retention, and accommodations for employees with disabilities;

“(2) assist each agency in establishing appropriate qualitative and quantitative measures and teleworking goals; and

“(3) consult with—

“(A) the Federal Emergency Management Agency on policy and policy guidance for telework in the areas of continuation of operations and long-term emergencies;

“(B) the General Services Administration on policy and policy guidance for telework in the areas of telework centers, travel, technology, equipment, and dependent care; and

“(C) the National Archives and Records Administration on policy and policy guidance for telework in the areas of efficient and effective records management and the preservation of records, including Presidential and Vice-Presidential records.

“(c) SECURITY GUIDELINES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in coordina-

tion with the Department of Homeland Security and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall issue guidelines not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this chapter to ensure the adequacy of information and security protections for information and information systems used while teleworking.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Guidelines issued under this subsection shall, at a minimum, include requirements necessary to—

“(A) control access to agency information and information systems;

“(B) protect agency information (including personally identifiable information) and information systems;

“(C) limit the introduction of vulnerabilities;

“(D) protect information systems not under the control of the agency that are used for teleworking;

“(E) safeguard wireless and other telecommunications capabilities that are used for teleworking; and

“(F) prevent inappropriate use of official time or resources that violates subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch by viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography.

“(d) CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANS.—

“(1) INCORPORATION INTO CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANS.—Each executive agency shall incorporate telework into the continuity of operations plan of that agency.

“(2) CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANS SUPERSEDE TELEWORK POLICY.—During any period that an executive agency is operating under a continuity of operations plan, that plan shall supersede any telework policy.

“(e) TELEWORK WEBSITE.—The Office of Personnel Management shall—

“(1) maintain a central telework website; and

“(2) include on that website related—

“(A) telework links;

“(B) announcements;

“(C) guidance developed by the Office of Personnel Management; and

“(D) guidance submitted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the General Services Administration to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 10 business days after the date of submission.

“(f) POLICY GUIDANCE ON PURCHASING COMPUTER SYSTEMS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue policy guidance requiring each executive agency when purchasing computer systems, to purchase computer systems that enable and support telework, unless the head of the agency determines that there is a mission-specific reason not to do so.

“§ 6505. Telework Managing Officer

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The head of each executive agency shall designate an employee of the agency as the Telework Managing Officer. The Telework Managing Officer shall be established within the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer or a comparable office with similar functions.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Telework Managing Officer shall—

“(1) be devoted to policy development and implementation related to agency telework programs;

“(2) serve as—

“(A) an advisor for agency leadership, including the Chief Human Capital Officer;

“(B) a resource for managers and employees; and

“(C) a primary agency point of contact for the Office of Personnel Management on telework matters; and

“(3) perform other duties as the applicable delegating authority may assign.

“(c) STATUS WITHIN AGENCY.—The Telework Managing Officer of an agency shall be a senior official of the agency who has direct access to the head of the agency.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING STATUS OF TELEWORK MANAGING OFFICER.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an individual who holds another office or position in an agency from serving as the Telework Managing Officer for the agency under this chapter.

“§ 6506. Reports

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘executive agency’ shall not include the Government Accountability Office.

“(b) REPORTS BY THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this chapter and on an annual basis thereafter, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with Chief Human Capital Officers Council, shall—

“(A) submit a report addressing the telework programs of each executive agency to—

“(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

“(ii) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) transmit a copy of the report to the Comptroller General and the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under this subsection shall include—

“(A) the degree of participation by employees of each executive agency in teleworking during the period covered by the report (and for each executive agency whose head is referred to under section 5312, the degree of participation in each bureau, division, or other major administrative unit of that agency), including—

“(i) the total number of employees in the agency;

“(ii) the number and percent of employees in the agency who are eligible to telework; and

“(iii) the number and percent of eligible employees in the agency who are teleworking—

“(I) 3 or more days per pay period;

“(II) 1 or 2 days per pay period;

“(III) once per month; and

“(IV) on an occasional, episodic, or short-term basis;

“(B) the method for gathering telework data in each agency;

“(C) if the total number of employees teleworking is 10 percent higher or lower than the previous year in any agency, the reasons for the positive or negative variation;

“(D) the agency goal for increasing participation to the extent practicable or necessary for the next reporting period, as indicated by the percent of eligible employees teleworking in each frequency category described under subparagraph (A)(iii);

“(E) an explanation of whether or not the agency met the goals for the last reporting period and, if not, what actions are being taken to identify and eliminate barriers to maximizing telework opportunities for the next reporting period;

“(F) an assessment of the progress each agency has made in meeting agency participation rate goals during the reporting period, and other agency goals relating to telework, such as the impact of telework on—

“(i) emergency readiness;

“(ii) energy use;

“(iii) recruitment and retention;

“(iv) performance;

“(v) productivity; and

“(vi) employee attitudes and opinions regarding telework; and

“(G) the best practices in agency telework programs.

“(C) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORTS.—

“(1) REPORT ON GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE TELEWORK PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this chapter and on an annual basis thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit a report addressing the telework program of the Government Accountability Office to—

“(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

“(ii) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted by the Comptroller General shall include the same information as required under subsection (b) applicable to the Government Accountability Office.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the submission of the first report to Congress required under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall review that report required under subsection (b) and submit a report to Congress on the progress each executive agency has made towards the goals established under section 6504(b)(2).

“(d) CHIEF HUMAN CAPITAL OFFICER REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each year the Chief Human Capital Officer of each executive agency, in consultation with the Telework Managing Officer of that agency, shall submit a report to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Chief Human Capital Officers Council on agency management efforts to promote telework.

“(2) REVIEW AND INCLUSION OF RELEVANT INFORMATION.—The Chair and Vice Chair of the Chief Human Capital Officers Council shall—

“(A) review the reports submitted under paragraph (1);

“(B) include relevant information from the submitted reports in the annual report to Congress required under subsection (b); and

“(C) use that relevant information for other purposes related to the strategic management of human capital.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 63 the following:

65. Telework 6501

(2) TELEWORK COORDINATORS.—

(A) APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003.—Section 623 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108-7; 117 Stat. 103) is amended by striking “designate a ‘Telework Coordinator’ to be” and inserting “designate a ‘Telework Managing Officer’ to be”.

(B) APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004.—Section 627 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199; 118 Stat. 99) is amended by striking “designate a ‘Telework Coordinator’ to be” and inserting “designate a ‘Telework Managing Officer’ to be”.

(C) APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005.—Section 622 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-447; 118 Stat. 2919) is amended by striking “designate a ‘Telework Coordinator’ to be” and inserting “designate a ‘Telework Managing Officer’ to be”.

(D) APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006.—Section 617 of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act,

2006 (Public Law 109-108; 119 Stat. 2340) is amended by striking “maintain a ‘Telework Coordinator’ to be” and inserting “maintain a Telework Managing Officer to be”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY FOR TELEWORK TRAVEL EXPENSES TEST PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5710 the following:

“§ 5711. Authority for telework travel expenses test programs

“(a) Except as provided under subsection (f)(1), in this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

“(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, under a test program which the Administrator of General Services determines to be in the interest of the Government and approves, an employing agency may pay through the proper disbursing official any necessary travel expenses in lieu of any payment otherwise authorized or required under this subchapter for employees participating in a telework program. Under an approved test program, an agency may provide an employee with the option to waive any payment authorized or required under this subchapter. An agency shall include in any request to the Administrator for approval of such a test program an analysis of the expected costs and benefits and a set of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

“(2) Any test program conducted under this section shall be designed to enhance cost savings or other efficiencies that accrue to the Government.

“(3) Under any test program, if an agency employee voluntarily relocates from the pre-existing duty station of that employee, the Administrator may authorize the employing agency to establish a reasonable maximum number of occasional visits to the pre-existing duty station before that employee is eligible for payment of any accrued travel expenses by that agency.

“(4) Nothing in this section is intended to limit the authority of any agency to conduct test programs.

“(c) The Administrator shall transmit a copy of any test program approved by the Administrator under this section, and the rationale for approval, to the appropriate committees of Congress at least 30 days before the effective date of the program.

“(d)(1) An agency authorized to conduct a test program under subsection (b) shall provide to the Administrator, the Telework Managing Officer of that agency, and the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the program not later than 3 months after completion of the program.

“(2) The results in a report described under paragraph (1) may include—

“(A) the number of visits an employee makes to the pre-existing duty station of that employee;

“(B) the travel expenses paid by the agency;

“(C) the travel expenses paid by the employee; or

“(D) any other information the agency determines useful to aid the Administrator, Telework Managing Officer, and Congress in understanding the test program and the impact of the program.

“(e) No more than 10 test programs under this section may be conducted simultaneously.

“(f)(1) In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate committee of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

“(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(2) The Patent and Trademark Office shall conduct a test program under this section, including the provision of reports in accordance with subsection (d)(1).

“(3) In conducting the program under this subsection, the Patent and Trademark Office may pay any travel expenses of an employee for travel to and from a Patent and Trademark Office worksite or provide an employee with the option to waive any payment authorized or required under this subchapter, if—

“(A) the employee is employed at a Patent and Trademark Office worksite and enters into an approved telework arrangement;

“(B) the employee requests to telework from a location beyond the local commuting area of the Patent and Trademark Office worksite; and

“(C) the Patent and Trademark Office approves the requested arrangement for reasons of employee convenience instead of an agency need for the employee to relocate in order to perform duties specific to the new location.

“(4)(A) The Patent and Trademark Office shall establish an oversight committee comprising an equal number of members representing management and labor, including representatives from each collective bargaining unit.

“(B) The oversight committee shall develop the operating procedures for the program under this subsection to—

“(i) provide for the effective and appropriate functioning of the program; and

“(ii) ensure that—

“(I) reasonable technological or other alternatives to employee travel are used before requiring employee travel, including teleconferencing, videoconferencing or internet-based technologies;

“(II) the program is applied consistently and equitably throughout the Patent and Trademark Office; and

“(III) an optimal operating standard is developed and implemented for maximizing the use of the telework arrangement described under paragraph (2) while minimizing agency travel expenses and employee travel requirements.

“(5)(A) The test program under this subsection shall be designed to enhance cost savings or other efficiencies that accrue to the Government.

“(B) The Director of the Patent and Trademark Office shall—

“(i) prepare an analysis of the expected costs and benefits and a set of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program; and

“(ii) before the test program is implemented, submit the analysis and criteria to the Administrator of General Services and to the appropriate committees of Congress.

“(C) With respect to an employee of the Patent and Trademark Office who voluntarily relocates from the pre-existing duty station of that employee, the operating procedures of the program may include a reasonable maximum number of occasional visits to the pre-existing duty station before that employee is eligible for payment of any accrued travel expenses by the Office.

“(g) The authority to conduct test programs under this section shall expire 7 years after the date of the enactment of the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 57 of

title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5710 the following:

“5711. Authority for telework travel expenses test programs.”.

SEC. 4. TELEWORK RESEARCH.

(a) RESEARCH BY OPM ON TELEWORK.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(1) research the utilization of telework by public and private sector entities that identify best practices and recommendations for the Federal Government;

(2) review the outcomes associated with an increase in telework, including the effects of telework on energy consumption, job creation and availability, urban transportation patterns, and the ability to anticipate the dispersal of work during periods of emergency; and

(3) make any studies or reviews performed under this subsection available to the public.

(b) USE OF CONTRACT TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may carry out subsection (a) under a contract entered into by the Director using competitive procedures under section 303 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253).

(c) USE OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The heads of Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction over the subject matters in subsection (a)(2) shall work cooperatively with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to carry out that subsection, if the Director determines that coordination is necessary to fulfill obligations under that subsection.

MOTION TO CONCUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lynch moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1721, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Federal workforce, Postal Service, and District of Columbia, I rise in support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010. I am pleased to offer for consideration this bipartisan legislation which seeks to improve and expand the access to telework for Federal employees in the

executive branch, as well as for government employees within the Government Accountability Office.

The cost-saving measure before us today was introduced by Congressman JOHN SARBANES of Maryland, along with myself and Representatives FRANK WOLF, GERRY CONNOLLY, JIM MORAN, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, and DANNY DAVIS back in March of 2009. This is the third time this good governance bill has been debated on the House floor.

This past July, the House considered and passed this legislation which subsequently was amended and passed by unanimous consent by our Senate counterparts in September. I would like to take a moment to thank Chairman AKAKA and Senator VOINOVICH on this legislation and to acknowledge Senator VOINOVICH's dedication to and respect for Federal employees. The Senator will be missed greatly by the Federal community.

Madam Speaker, despite the evolving nature of the way the Federal Government conducts its affairs, telework, which allows an employee to regularly perform work in a remote location, continues to be woefully underutilized by Federal agencies. Private and public sector employers that offer telework consistently experience increased productivity and retention rates, thereby lowering an employer's operating costs.

More specifically, independent research states that increased use of telework saves employers money by reducing the amount of needed office space, parking facilities, and building maintenance fees and utilities. Given that the Federal Government owns or leases over 8,600 individual buildings and spends upwards of \$500 billion as a landlord annually, this legislation will translate into real-world savings in the near future.

Successful Federal telework programs such as those used by the General Services Administration and the Defense Information Systems Agency show how telework enhances an agency's customer's service offering for our citizens while at the same time achieving greater cost efficiencies and lowering taxpayer costs.

H.R. 1722 provides for increased numbers of Federal employees to participate in telework programs by requiring agencies to develop comprehensive telework policies within 1 year for authorized employees and by directing the Office of Personnel Management to develop regulations on overall telework policies and to annually evaluate and report on agency telework programs.

H.R. 1722 also seeks to elevate the importance of incorporating telework into the community of operations planning of agencies in order to ensure that they are better prepared to maintain essential operations during emergencies. I am confident all of my colleagues appreciate the need for agencies to be able to operate during a time

of crisis when access to office buildings might be impossible.

A less distressing, but by no means less critical, role for the telework program is to assist agencies in carrying out their missions during difficult weather conditions. Office of Personnel Management Director John Berry estimates that the use of telework reduced the estimated cost of lost productivity during the 2009 snowstorms here in the Nation's capital by approximately \$30 million per day.

□ 1200

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the legislation before us is PAYGO-neutral, meaning there is no mandatory spending in this bill. The Congressional Budget Office does, however, estimate that approximately \$28 million will be needed over 5 years to implement the requirement in the bill. However, it is unlikely that any additional appropriations will be necessary because Federal agencies can reasonably implement the bill's requirements from existing budgets.

While you may hear from colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this telework is a costly and unnecessary legislative mandate, I must point out that the Congressional Budget Office estimate they are relying on looks only at the implementation costs and not at the bill's potential cost savings. A closer look at the potential benefits of increased telework will reveal that H.R. 1722 actually saves the government money down the road, which has also been the case among telework-embracing private sector companies such as IBM, which, for example, reports that it saves \$56 million a year in reduced office space costs by permitting its employees to telework.

In fact, we only have to look at the Patent and Trademark Office to see such advantages within government. The Patent and Trademark Office, which has been an agency leader in telework efforts, reports that it was able to consolidate nearly 50,000 square feet of space, thereby avoiding \$1.5 million in rent per year through greater use of telework. Additionally, the agency avoided securing \$11 million in additional office space as a direct result of the agency's telework hoteling programs. Private-sector companies are seeing similar benefits from increased telework. We can expect many other government agencies to begin to reap the benefits of lower overhead costs because of this bill.

Telework also leads to greater worker productivity. Greater productivity in the Federal workforce provides an important benefit to the taxpayer. For example, the Patent and Trademark Office also reports that increased utilization of telework has reduced the amount of sick leave taken by its employees and increased worker retention. As we have seen, the government can benefit from this bill by lowering overhead costs and increasing worker productivity. This is a win-win for the

taxpayer. When we take a common-sense approach to our cost-savings efforts, it is easy to see that the potential to save tens of millions of dollars every year in increased productivity and lower overhead is an excellent return on an initial investment of \$28 million over 5 years.

Lastly, this past summer, our committee worked in a bipartisan fashion with Mr. ISSA and with the Senate on amending this bill. While the bill before us looks somewhat different from what was previously agreed to in the House, I would like to note that the Federal employees who have been disciplined for being absent at work or for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography on a government computer while performing official duties will not be allowed to telework.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act. This legislation is aimed at ensuring Federal agencies are able to operate 24/7, as the public expects a 21st century employer to act, and to do so more cheaply. A vote in favor of this bill is a vote for the future.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, in the interest of fairness to one of our Members who has been very engaged in this issue, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Since the stimulus passed in February of 2009, the private sector has shed over 3.2 million jobs, and our national unemployment rate now stands at a staggering 9.5 percent. With the rest of America struggling to make ends meet, it is unconscionable that my Democratic colleagues think that we should give yet another perk to Federal employees. By requiring Federal agencies to duplicate an existing law, and allowing them to spend a fourth of their time out of the office and on a mobile work site, H.R. 1722 will cost the taxpayers another \$30 million while promoting an even more inefficient Federal workforce.

Madam Speaker, this is now the third time the House will consider this legislation. When H.R. 1722 initially failed to pass under suspension of the rules in May, the Democratic majority brought it up again under a closed rule in July. It was only then that my Republican colleagues and I had the opportunity to amend this bill through a successful motion to recommit which made a number of improvements to this legislation. However, as H.R. 1722 was considered in the Senate, this motion to recommit was completely dismantled. A provision that required an agency to certify to the Office of Personnel Management that the agency's telework program will save money, rather than increasing spending, was stripped from the bill.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, a provision that would prohibit Federal employees with seriously delinquent tax debts from teleworking was removed. A third item required employees of the Executive Office of the President to copy their official e-mail accounts on any business communications that are made on personal e-mail and social media accounts. This would ensure that Federal employees are actually working instead of socializing on official time. Unfortunately, this requirement is now gone. Finally, Madam Speaker, I am most disappointed that the provision included in the House-passed version of H.R. 1722, that would have prohibited Federal employees from engaging in union recruiting or collective bargaining activities while teleworking on official, taxpayer-funded time, has been removed by the Senate Democrats. OPM reported that in fiscal year 2008 alone, nearly 3 million official time hours were used in collective bargaining or arbitration of grievances against an employer. It equates to over \$120 million of tax money spent on union activities, Madam Speaker. That's irresponsible to use these dollars for nonrelated official duties while on official time.

Madam Speaker, the motion to recommit was necessary to save precious tax dollars and ensure the integrity of the Federal workforce. How will we obtain the trust of the American people who are struggling every day in this economy if we allow Federal employees to participate in union activities while on official time, give them benefits when they're delinquent on their taxes, and increase spending in Federal agencies trying to make this flawed teleworking system work?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, now is not the time to increase the bureaucratic maze in Washington but to rein in the overlapping, redundant policies that have made the Federal Government so large. We must reduce spending and diligently work towards a more efficient and more effective government that can live within its means. I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Representative JOHN SARBANES, the lead sponsor of this measure.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank Chairman TOWNS, Chairman LYNCH, Chairman DAVIS, who I worked with previously on this bill, cosponsors GERRY CONNOLLY, JIM MORAN, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, and others who have collaborated with us on bringing this bill forward. I also want to take a moment to salute FRANK WOLF, our colleague on the other side of the aisle. He has worked

on this issue for two decades, and he has been a tremendous advocate for telework, and I appreciate all of his support and collaboration as we develop these ideas going forward.

I was listening to the end of that statement that was just made, calling for efficiency and effectiveness in government, ways to address the bureaucracy and so forth. I can't think of a piece of legislation that does more to meet those objectives than this does. It creates a nimbleness on the part of the Federal Government with respect to how the workforce operates. And if you look at the goals that it seeks to promote, they all make perfect sense. They are common sense. First of all, the benefits include that you can improve productivity among the workforce. All the studies show that morale goes up, productivity goes up. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, as it was referenced, can demonstrate huge increases in productivity among the workforce. So that is a benefit. It increases competitiveness. When the Federal Government goes into the marketplace, goes into the workplace to try to recruit good people, its ability to show that the telework opportunity is there is something that makes it more competitive in getting the best quality people to become part of our Federal Government.

When it comes to continuing operations in some kind of a crisis situation, if you have the telework capacity, you've got some recourse. The best evidence of this most recently was last year when we had the snowstorm shut down the government essentially for 3 days. But during those 3 days, those who had the ability to telework were able to continue to operate. And the estimate by John Berry, heading the Office of Personnel Management, was that it saved the Federal Government \$30 million per day in terms of productivity that otherwise would have been lost. And that just gets to the cost question. Again, we've heard this objection based on the costs. The savings that will be generated when our Federal agencies adopt these telework policies will far outweigh any of the costs of implementing this program. So it's a very commonsense approach.

□ 1210

And what the bill does is very straightforward. It requires the agencies to have a telework policy in place to encourage it, to promote it, not to impose it on people who because of their particular job shouldn't be teleworking or don't want to do this, but to make sure that they have the opportunity to do it and to know that the agency encourages that kind of thing.

It appoints telework managing officers so there's a person designated within each agency who takes responsibility for this, so that they can actually help to implement it over time.

It has good evaluation components. The GAO and the Office of Personnel Management will conduct evaluations

on a periodic basis to determine the progress that this is making and come up with suggestions and recommendations going forward.

And then it also encourages, as I indicated before, that these agencies develop plans for continuing operations under difficult circumstances, taking advantage of telework.

So, for all these reasons, for the benefits that it bestows, for the objectives that it meets, for the commonsense aspect of it, I heartily urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), one of the early innovators that really brought telework to the Federal workforce.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I would say, as the gentleman and I were talking, I did support the motion to recommit and I thought there were many, many good ideas in it. This bill, though, where we are today I think is a good bill for the country.

As someone who has worked on this issue for more than 18 years, I think it is good legislation. There is nothing magic about strapping yourself into a metal box and driving 50 miles and sitting at a metal desk, because that's not necessarily the way that we do things in the 21st century.

This bill saves money. It's important for Members to know that this bill saves money. This bill reduces the footprint of the government. This bill is deficit neutral and strengthens the continuation of operations plan in the event of a disaster such as a hurricane, like Katrina, or the massive snowstorm, as was previously mentioned, or in the event of an earthquake such as the Loma Prieta, the 1989 World Series earthquake, or in the event of a terrorist attack.

I was here on 9/11. The Pentagon was hit. Cell phones did not work. Nothing worked. The government was fundamentally shut down. If we had had more people teleworking, we would have had the continuity and have been better able to function, particularly during that dark day of the enemy attack.

During the February snowstorm, this bill saved money.

This legislation adopts many of the best management practices that many companies, most companies now in the private sector are using. Almost every major company in the private sector has telework. And when you say you want the government to be more like the private sector, this is the answer.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, every Member, or maybe almost every Member of this institution teleworks when they pick up their BlackBerry or their iPhone. To say that you have to be sitting at your desk office computer to be doing your work is just not accurate. That's like saying every Member is not working if they're not in their office

sitting at their laptop. That doesn't make any sense.

This brings the government into the 21st century, and I urge strong support of this.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the tireless efforts of the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, and was pleased to work with him to author this legislation. I also thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. TOWNS, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. LYNCH, for their work to advance this legislation, as well as our colleagues in the Senate who worked on the text of what we are considering today, including Senators AKAKA, VOINOVICH, LIEBERMAN, COLLINS, and COBURN.

This is good, bipartisan legislation, which was also strengthened in the House through the work of my colleague from Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, and my colleague from West Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO.

My colleagues will detail why this legislation is important, that it is deficit neutral, that it strengthens our COOP, Continuation of Operations Plans, in the event of disasters such as a hurricane, like Katrina, or a massive snowstorm, like what occurred this past February, or in the event of an earthquake, such as the Loma Prieta, the World Series earthquake, or in the event of a terrorist attack. In all these instances, telework was vital in ensuring that our government continued to operate.

In their song *The Boxer*, Simon and Garfunkel said that "man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest." That, unfortunately, has been the case with this legislation.

Despite what you may hear, this is good legislation. Telework is good government policy.

This legislation is about doing more with less. Let me repeat—telework is about doing more with less. It is about adapting best practice procedures from the private sector that companies, such as IMB, use daily. It is about saving money. It is about reducing the size, the footprint, of the Federal Government. It is about forcing the Federal Government into the 21st century workplace.

During the February snowstorm, telework allowed the Federal Government to recoup the \$30 million a day for each day that the government was shut down. Imagine how much would have been saved if more people were teleworking?

It was through my work with members, such as the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, that we forced the government to recognize the benefits of telework. When I was chairman of the Science-State-Justice and Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee, I inserted the language to mandate that agencies increase telework opportunities for eligible employees.

Why? Because agencies weren't following our directives, our intent. The intent of the Congress to make the government more efficient. And this is what is happening now—telework isn't being used to its fullest extent. And maybe that's because of a lack of information, or reluctant management, or a combination of both. This legislation will not fix all the problems that exist. But it will go a long way toward improvement.

Work is something you do, not someplace you go. There is no magic to strapping yourself in a metal box and driving, sometimes up to an hour and a half to our workplaces, and sitting in front of our computers all day.

Information accessed at workplaces can just as easily be accessed from computers in our

living rooms. With the American family under attack, telework provides the opportunities for parents to spend more time with their families, and everyone to enjoy things they like to do.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his long time, 18 years, of leadership on this issue.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), our distinguished chairman and a champion of this cause as well for many years.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, let me just say that I'm happy today to be here. And of course Congresswoman Wolf just indicated that he's been working on this for 18 years. And of course I think that the time is right to move this legislation forward.

As chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010.

I want to congratulate Representative SARBANES for his persistence and his hard work on the legislation. I also want to commend Representative LYNCH, the chairman of the Federal Workforce Committee, for his help in guiding this legislation through the process. I also want to thank the ranking member on the Republican side, of course, for his work as well.

H.R. 1722 will increase the Federal Government's use of telework. This will make the Federal workforce more efficient and better prepared to handle all emergencies. Telework saves the government money, reduces energy consumption, and increases worker productivity.

This bill passed the House by an overwhelming margin on July 14, 2010. The Senate amended the bill and passed it by unanimous consent on September 29, 2010. It is time for us to send this bill to the President for his signature.

The Senate changes in H.R. 1722 represent a compromise between the House-passed bill and Senate legislation introduced by Senator AKAKA. And of course I fully support this bipartisan compromise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TOWNS. The Senate amendment includes key provisions from the House bill, including language drafted by the ranking member of the Oversight Committee, Representative ISSA, and ranking member of the Federal Workforce Subcommittee, Representative CHAFETZ. This discussion that led to the compromise we have before us today included Members from both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol. This bill is the fruit of an inclusive and comprehensive process.

I strongly support this bipartisan, good government bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana

(Mr. BURTON), the former chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I support this bill, but I think there's something of an immediate import that needs to be discussed, so I'm going to diverge just a little bit from the subject matter.

Yesterday, Ahmed Ghailani, 36, who was involved in the killing of Americans at the embassies in Tanzania and elsewhere in Kenya that killed 224 people, including 12 Americans—the military tribunal down at Guantanamo was prepared to try him, but the administration and our Justice Department said he should be tried in civil court in New York and there would be justice meted out. He was indicted on 286 counts for murdering Americans and others at our embassies in those two countries, and he was let off on all but one count. Two hundred eighty-five counts were ruled out.

He killed Americans. He's a terrorist. He worked with Osama Bin Laden. He bought dynamite. He bought the telephone that set off the dynamite. He took the detonators to his house and stored them there. He is a murderer. He is a terrorist.

Now, right now we have American men and women serving in our embassies around the world, and this is the kind of message we're sending, that terrorists can get away with killing Americans in our embassies. It's unconscionable that this administration and the Justice Department should let this happen.

If you look back in history, this kind of an incident would have been tried in a military tribunal, and they wanted to do it. But our Justice Department and our President said no, they would get justice in the civil court. They got justice all right. But did we, the American people?

□ 1220

We've sent a message to terrorists around the world that, hey, you can kill Americans, but you'll get off pretty light if you get into an American courtroom. Isn't that tragic? It's tragic.

They're cutting off heads of people, they're blowing up embassies, they're blowing up ships. They flew a plane into the World Trade Center on 9/11. The mastermind behind that is down at Guantanamo. Are we going to try him in a civil case in New York? That's what they want to do. And if they do that, are we going to let him off? He was the mastermind behind 9/11 that killed over 3,000 people.

I would just say, if I were talking to the President—and I wish I could—I would say, “Mr. President, this is a travesty of justice, and your Justice Department should be instructed to try these people in military tribunals.”

No more of this baloney. American lives are at stake and the security of America is at stake.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vir-

ginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) who has been at the forefront of this debate and who has been a great advocate and champion on behalf of Federal workers.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his leadership, and particularly cite Congressman SARBANES for his leadership, and my Republican colleague from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, who laid out the merits of the case of the Telework Improvements Act.

I have spent the last 10 years here in the national capital region encouraging the public sector to follow the lead of the private sector in promoting telework.

In my district, for example, AT&T, a private employer, one-third of its workforce teleworks; not because it adds to corporate costs, but because in fact it detracts from corporate costs; not because it takes away efficiency, but in fact it improves productivity.

In the national capital region, there is almost no region in the country that lends itself better to telework because of the nature of the white-collar workforce than does this.

In the private sector, we are looking at close to 20 percent telework rates, improving productivity, improving retention and recruitment, improving the air quality of this region, and in fact contributing to the bottom line.

Unfortunately, in the public sector, we fall behind. We are only at 6 or 7 percent in the Federal workforce, and that is the largest single employer in the national capital region. And we are a nonattainment region in terms of air quality. We can and we must do better.

Telework is an important and cost-effective component of efforts to reduce congestion, greenhouse gas pollution, and smog. According to the Telework Exchange, if 20 percent of Americans teleworked, we could eliminate 67 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually, and reduce Persian Gulf oil imports by 40 percent, something many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle I know are concerned about.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions would lead to a reduction in ground-level ozone in our region, which is critically important to protect the health of our region's seniors and those with respiratory ailments.

Today, as I said, 6 to 7 percent of eligible Federal employees telework on a regular basis, even though the largely white collar workforce in our region is so well suited for it.

When I was the chairman of Fairfax County, we started an aggressive program to get to 20 percent of our eligible workforce teleworking by 2005. We met the goal, we exceeded the goal, we have sustained that rate ever since. I am here to tell my colleagues that it improved our efficiency, it saved taxpayer money, it improved productivity, and it gave us a tool to recruit and retain the workforce of the future.

We must remember that with the baby boom generation ready to retire,

47 percent of the entire Federal workforce will be eligible to retire this decade. We've got to have flexible tools that help us to replace those skilled workers. Telework is a great way that costs us no money that can make a big difference.

The Telework Improvements Act is an extraordinarily important piece of legislation because it will help us meet critical policy goals: savings of taxpayer money, improved federal efficiency, reduction of dependence on foreign oil, and improvement in Continuity of Operations Plans. I thank Congressman SARBANES, Congressman WOLF, Office of Personnel Management Director John Berry, and Subcommittee Chairman STEPHEN LYNCH for their leadership.

This legislation will save taxpayer money, and is PAYGO compliant. My colleagues will recall that the federal government was shut down for a week this winter due to snow. Regardless of whether future federal closures are due to snow, other natural disasters, or a potential terrorist attack, telework is an essential part of our Continuity of Operations Plans that allow the federal government to stay open despite disruptions to our transportation infrastructure. This February, the federal government saved \$30 million every day by achieving a 30 percent telework rate during the snow storm. Each additional percentage point of telework achievement would have represented another million dollars saved for taxpayers. Let us not forgo that savings for taxpayers in the future.

Telework is an essential part of federal personnel policy because it can help recruit and retain federal employees, maintain continuity of operations in the event of an emergency, and reduce congestion and related air pollution. With 48 percent of the federal workforce eligible for retirement within the next 5 to 10 years, we must provide benefits that attract highly qualified employees.

Telework is an important and cost-effective component of efforts to reduce congestion, greenhouse gas pollution, and smog. According to the Telework Exchange, if 20 percent of Americans teleworked, we could eliminate 67 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually and reduce Persian Gulf oil imports by 40 percent. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions would lead to a reduction in ground level ozone in our region, which is critically important to protect the health of our region's seniors and other residents suffering from respiratory ailments or asthma.

Today, less than 10 percent of eligible federal employees telework on a regular basis, even though the largely white collar workforce in our region is well suited for telework. By contrast, Fairfax County, the largest suburb of the National Capital Region, has 20 percent of eligible employees teleworking at least 1 day per week, and other jurisdictions from this region are approaching that regional target. The Telework Improvements Act provides a vehicle to increase telework participation by designating a Telework Managing Officer from within current staff for each agency and by integrating Continuity of Operations Planning performance metrics. According to a recently completed survey from the Office of Personnel Management, at least 64 percent of federal employees are eligible to telework, yet most are not allowed to do so by their managers. The Telework Improvements Act will help

change management culture to support telework.

I urge my colleagues to support the Telework Improvements Act, which will improve the efficiency of the federal government, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and improve our national security.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the First District of Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I would like to thank him, also, for his leadership in this issue.

I rise today in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvement Act.

This legislation will foster the use of telework by Federal agencies by ensuring that each agency has a telework policy, and that employees are informed about their eligibility to telework. This bill would ensure that those Federal employees who are eligible to telework are able to do so, with an emphasis on enhancing agency operations and productivity.

Virginia's First District is home to thousands of Federal employees, many of whom commute hours each day. Despite the fact that there are such numerous benefits to teleworking, such as reduced traffic congestion and energy consumption, cost savings, competitive hiring and retention, readiness and emergency preparedness, many Federal agencies continue to underutilize telework.

The snowstorm last winter, as we have heard referred to today, which closed the Federal Government several days is a good example of how teleworking programs can achieve cost savings. We saw during that time that 30 percent of our Federal workers actually teleworked during that snowstorm, achieving \$30 million daily in reduced costs for that Federal workforce being offsite. As Representative WOLF so stated there, that, I think, is a great example of the potential savings that can be achieved through teleworking.

Under this legislation, Federal employees handling classified information, though, would not be eligible to telework. This policy effectively prevents the use of teleworking programs by employees who need access to classified information specifically in the areas of defense, homeland security, law enforcement, and intelligence.

The Director of the National Intelligence Agency's Vision 2015 states that there is a definite need for cross-organizational collaboration, cross-functional teams, and joint duty amongst the intelligence agencies, and this is going to require a much more agile infrastructure.

Vision 2015, as it is identified, suggests that the intelligence community will have to shift from the current centralized model, where employees are consolidated in a single location, to a model where a dispersed workforce can

rapidly come together in a virtual environment to respond to new tasks and missions. This workforce is going to have to be flexible and is going to have to be spread out so that strategically we can meet whatever challenges this Nation may face in the future.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to further explore the potential of secure teleworking. Robust teleworking programs at Federal agencies will get cars off congested roads, enhance productivity, reduce costs, and ensure continuity of operations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia's remarks.

At this time, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank Chairman LYNCH and Mr. SARBANES for this important bill which takes telework from policy to practice. What progress we have made in telework we owe largely to members of this region, but especially to Mr. WOLF.

The Telework Enhancement Act takes telework all the way from a piece of policy lying on paper to be picked up at will, or not picked up, to a real practice with savings in productivity flowing directly to the Federal Government. The bill converts telework from a passive to an affirmative policy of the Federal Government, along with all the productivity and savings that have been documented to occur. It essentially makes going to work by telework the functional equivalent of getting on the road or getting on a crowded Metro car.

Although this bill will be implemented nationwide, the two snowstorms in this region should have shocked private and public entities alike into telework. Admittedly, though, those are exceptional circumstances—9/11, natural disasters, continuity of operations—all are important, but they are far from the only reasons for this bill.

Government has spent billions of dollars in state-of-the-art technology. This technology is underutilized as long as telework itself is underutilized. Nothing is more inefficient for employees and the government alike than compelling an employee to fight some of the worst traffic congestion in the Nation to get to a Federal office. Nothing is more costly to the government than requiring every employee lock-step to come to a physical place and do the work that could be accomplished with increased productivity and output at home. Nothing is of greater benefit to the oil cartels and to the trade deficit than forcing people on the road. Nothing is more disruptive to two-parent and single-parent families alike than time spent from home, sometimes an hour or two each day in this region, which can now be converted to family life and more work accomplished right there at home.

□ 1230

This bill had a bipartisan vote in committee because there was no addition to the deficit, because management, training limits on who can qualify, and emergency measures are all in place. Going to the office to do a job that can be done in less time, more output, greater savings to the government is so 20th century. This is not 1950. It's time our government came into the 21st century to have in place a set of alternatives that provide employees a better way to get the same job done.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, could I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Could I further inquire as to how many additional speakers the majority has?

Mr. LYNCH. I have one additional speaker.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a bill, an underlying bill, an underlying concept that not only do I endorse and appreciate, but I knew and worked with extensively in the private sector. There's no question in the private sector telecommuting continues to grow. But there are a couple of things I would like to straighten up out here today in consideration of this bill.

First of all, Madam Speaker, every Member of Congress has a BlackBerry. So do most major members of the Federal workforce. Many of us have portable devices like this iPad. The fact is there is no shortage of telecommuting tools presently at use in the Federal workforce. We are not talking about the ability to telecommute. We are talking about a new bureaucratic mandate within the Federal regime that requires each agency have a specific entity for that purpose, and we are doing so without the safeguards that my motion to recommit offered and overwhelmingly was accepted before the election.

When I say before the election, I think it's also important to note, this will be the first vote after the American people said "no" to government waste, fraud, and abuse; government growth, government spending. And yet the Senate, before the election, stripped out of this bill something as innocuous as each agency having to show that telecommuting additions were going to be net cost savings. In other words, with all the bravado about how this wasn't going to cost but it was going to save, what was stripped out of this was any kind of assertion, not an assertion that required an audit, but just an assertion by the agency head that their efforts were going to save money.

I was here for the snowstorm of last year, and I just want the American people who may not have been able to

be here in Washington, D.C., to understand that it was quite a snowstorm. And I appreciate the estimate of \$30 million a day of savings. But I might also remind the American people that every restaurant was open and doing great business and the parks were filled with people having snowball fights. In fact, what really happened was the Federal workforce got a paid holiday while people who had to figure out how to make a buck found a way to get their people to work so they could still sell to those Federal workers who were having a holiday.

It is, in fact, more common for the Federal workforce to say, go ahead, stay at home. That probably begs the question of telecommuting. But then the question is where in this bill do we require people who are telecommuting not to get a day off because it snows since they are in their home where the snow shouldn't be affecting them?

We have a lot of safeguards not in the bill. I'm convinced today with the current majority that this bill will probably pass as it is. I intend to bring back in the next Congress additional reforms and hold oversight as appropriate to make sure that we improve that which is not being dealt with today. I expect I will have the same bipartisan support that we had throughout this process in the House. I am mostly disappointed that with an overwhelming, over 303 votes here in the House for the bill as it was, that it came back to us without things that we thought should be in it.

Madam Speaker, I don't want to be a partisan. But I do believe it's important that we consider that one of the items that was in this bill when it left the House was a prohibition on basically union work outside of the cover of office. We have collective bargaining agreements almost universally within the Federal Government. We also have regulations about these people whether they have to do other work or not. This bill lacks the safeguard so that somebody can basically take a Blackberry and a notebook, disappear forever and be almost unaccountable as to whether they ever did any of their core work while doing their union organizing and running activity. That's not in the best interest of the taxpayers. It's not what the last election was about. It's not what I had hoped to see.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Federal Workforce Subcommittee, Mr. Danny Davis of Illinois.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to first of all thank Chairman LYNCH for yielding time. I also want to commend Mr. SARBANES for the continuous work that he has done to bring this legislation before us today. I also want to commend Mr. WOLF because for a long time he has been the champion of this legislation, and all of us appreciate his work.

I'm pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill which provides opportunities to do

a number of things. First of all, it saves money. All of us have talked about saving, trying to make sure that we are as efficient and as effective as a Federal Government, as any workforce, as we can possibly be. I don't think that there is any doubt in anyone's mind that we can save money.

It also provides an opportunity to deal with another issue, and that's the issue of the environment. How do we reduce the smog emissions? How do we help clean up and clear up the environment? Well if you could imagine, reducing not only in the Washington, D.C., area, but in other large metropolitan areas, the large number of vehicles that we have moving to and from, and especially in instances where we know the work can be done. And I think the U.S. Patent Office has proven without a doubt that you can, in fact, be effective, you can be efficient, you can do a good job, and you can get the job done.

So I commend all of those who are in support of this legislation. Again, I want to thank Chairman LYNCH for giving me time to participate.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I have said most of what has to be said, and I'm not going to use all of the time that the minority has. This bill, as I said, will probably pass, and it will be a shame. I would hope that all Republicans and Democrats who know this could be better and voted for it when it was better would also vote against it, not because the outcome is certain, but because we have an opportunity to say we're not going to produce a new bureaucracy without some reservation when we know it could have been better.

This is not a bill that creates the opportunity for telework. Every agency that sees this bill will look and say, darn, I've got to create a special entity that is a telework czar entity. They will know that for what it is. What it doesn't do is it doesn't give them the kind of additional new guidelines that really would keep this from being, in some cases, just a mandate for a perk, and in other cases a mandate for an agency creation within an agency.

I think that's the most dangerous part of what we do. We should never, never give the Federal Government a requirement to do something and not give them the guidance, authority, and statute necessary to make sure they do it right. We have that responsibility. The executive branch is, in fact, the administrative branch. For them to administer, we either need to give them the rules or require that they create rules that are sensible and then create oversight for it.

That's not what this bill does today. As I said, in no case will this create one new telework job. It simply will create a new bureaucracy, and it does so without any of the protections the motion to recommit, widely accepted by the House, brought before the elections.

□ 1240

Additionally, creating efficiency in government is now essential. When we reconvene in January, our problem will be \$1.4 trillion worth of spending—spending greater than what the American people are willing to pay or are able to pay to fund our government. That means to us that we're going to have to find a way to have less Federal workers, Federal workers that cost less, Federal workers that need less facilities. So I will continue to support telework if it means that we're not building new Federal buildings, we're not causing the infrastructure to grow; in other words, Madam Speaker, that we're saving money.

I'm sad to say that this bill, when it is signed by the President, will do none of that. But the President knows, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget knows, the Vice President knows, the House knows, and certainly the Senate knows that we have a long way to go when we talk about private sector telecommuting to be as efficient as the private sector. We are not. What we do is in fact we use the word "telecommute" often to say, Well, look, we're using the gadgets. We must be doing better.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. We should do better. I understand this is an important vote to many people who feel that the Federal workforce needs a perk, a symbol that we're going to do something for them. Madam Speaker, this is not doing something for the Federal workforce unless the American people have confidence that the Federal workforce is becoming leaner, more efficient, more effective in doing what the people want done for them. In that case, Madam Speaker, I will recommend that all of my side and as many of those that will listen on the other side of the aisle vote "no" today as a symbol that in fact we can do better.

The guidance from the Congress should be to increase efficiency and to describe that in a way in which the Federal workforce can have confidence that we're on the same team, we're on the same side. We want them to avoid excessive commuting. We want this to be more efficient and effective. But we also want to be a Congress that provides such guidelines as necessary rather than simply a mandate for a new bureaucracy in every agency that is now going to be the telecommuting agency.

With that, Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because we did work long and hard to try to get a better bill. We sent the Senate a better bill. We now, today, can only consider what has been brought before us.

I recommend a "no" vote and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. At this time I just want to thank Mr. WOLF and Mr. WITTMAN, my colleagues across the other side of the aisle who stood and spoke in favor of this bill. Despite the highlight of our

differences, I would like to remind our colleagues that this bill was entirely acceptable to all of the Democratic and Republicans on the Oversight Committee prior to this bill reaching the floor.

H.R. 1722 received full consideration by the Federal Workforce Subcommittee that I chair. It was referred unanimously by the subcommittee to the full Oversight Committee. And during the full committee consideration, I am proud to say that Republican amendments were offered and they were accepted and the legislation was then advanced to the House without a single objection by any Republican member. And I am proud of that fact. That is bipartisanship. My friends on the other side of the aisle, good Republicans, had every opportunity to attempt to add additional provisions in the committee, where they would have received full consideration rather than the 5 minutes of hurried debate prior to the vote on the Republican motion to recommit.

But today I'm pleased that we have the opportunity to consider the excellent, comprehensive, bipartisan compromise we were able to negotiate with the Senate. And I would also like to add that all the House and Senate committee staff, majority and minority, met following Senate passage to discuss possible alternatives that would be acceptable.

This has been a bipartisan process. This is something I think we can agree on. I would not want the perfect to be the enemy of the good in this case. I think we have a good bill here. I think there's been good input from both sides of the aisle here, and it shows in the end product.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, as a representative of a district with a large number of Federal employees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1722, The Telework Improvements Act. I want to thank Chairmen TOWNS and LYNCH and Representative SARBANES for their leadership in crafting this important bipartisan bill.

The Telework Improvements Act makes administrative, fiscal and environmental sense. If passed, the measure will save money for the American taxpayers, make government operations more efficient, and put the Federal Government on equal footing with many private sector employers and State governments which allow their employees to perform many of their duties and responsibilities from home or at another work site.

Passing this bill will help attract more workers to government service. There is an effort under way to encourage more young people to work for the Federal Government to offset the growing number of older employees who are retiring. Offering prospective employees the option to telework increases the possibility that those employees with families will join the Federal workforce.

Passing this bill is smart fiscal policy. According to the Office of Personnel Management, during the blizzard that hit Washington, DC last winter, the government lost tens of millions of dollars worth of productivity for each day it remained closed. This number

might have been far larger had some Federal workers not had the opportunity to work from home. The bill will also reduce costs for taxpayers by lowering absenteeism.

Passing this bill makes environmental sense. Increasing teleworking opportunities for employees of the country's largest employer means fewer cars on the roads and lower carbon emissions. According to the Telework Exchange, if 20 percent of Americans teleworked, we could eliminate 67 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually and reduce Persian Gulf oil imports by 40 percent.

Madam Speaker, passing The Telework Improvements Act will save money for the taxpayer, help ease pressure on the environment and make the government run more efficiently. The bill is also PAYGO compliant.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill and I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. LYNCH. I ask all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 1722, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of this motion is postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ISSA. At the end of debate, isn't it appropriate to call for the vote prior to postponing for the yeas and nays? I heard no request for it. Are we postponing further debate, even though debate has concluded, rather than a House vote and then postponing a recorded vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Time for debate has expired. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion has been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CONTINUATION ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6419) to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the further extension of emergency unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) by striking "November 30, 2010" each place it appears and inserting "February 28, 2011";

(B) in the heading for paragraph (2) of subsection (b), by striking "NOVEMBER 30, 2010" and inserting "FEBRUARY 28, 2011"; and

(C) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "April 30, 2011" and inserting "July 31, 2011".

(2) Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(A) by striking "December 1, 2010" each place it appears and inserting "March 1, 2011"; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking "May 1, 2011" and inserting "August 1, 2011".

(3) Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking "April 30, 2011" and inserting "July 31, 2011".

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking "and" at the end; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

"(G) the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act; and".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-205; 124 Stat. 2236).

SEC. 3. OPTION FOR STATES TO TEMPORARILY MODIFY CERTAIN "ON" AND "OFF" INDICATORS RELATING TO EXTENDED BENEFITS.

(a) INDICATORS BASED ON RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.—Section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by inserting before the last sentence the following: "Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), and ending on or before March 1, 2011, the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State 'on' or 'off' indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if paragraph (1)(A) had been amended by striking 'the preceding two calendar years' and inserting 'the preceding three calendar years'; except that, notwithstanding any such provision of State law, any week for which there would otherwise be a State 'on' indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State 'off' indicator.".

(b) INDICATORS BASED ON RATE OF TOTAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—Section 203(f) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), and ending on or before March 1, 2011, the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State ‘on’ or ‘off’ indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if paragraph (1)(A)(ii) had been amended—

“(A) by striking ‘either (or both)’ and inserting ‘any (or all)’; and

“(B) by striking ‘the preceding 2 calendar years’ and inserting ‘the preceding 3 calendar years’.

Notwithstanding any provision of a State law described in this paragraph, any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.”.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 5. EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

This Act—

(1) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g));

(2) in the House of Representatives, is designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles; and

(3) in the Senate, is designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is called an emergency bill because it is an emergency. For millions of people, this is an emergency. Unemployment benefits are going to run out in a few days. Therefore, it is an emergency for the United States of America. And let me just indicate what is at stake here.

Through January 1 of next year, close to 2 million people will not any longer be eligible for benefits. And then, a month later, the amount almost doubles. This is an emergency.

Last night, I was in my office at 9:30 and a person called from Atlanta, Georgia, to thank me and to thank Mr. McDERMOTT and to thank our party for bringing up this extension.

I don't know what more any of us want. I don't see how we can go home for Thanksgiving when, as a result of failure of benefits, hundreds of thou-

sands of people may not have a turkey on their table because they can't afford it and the next week may not have the moneys they need to meet their daily needs.

This should be a bipartisan effort. This is a totally human effort. This is totally an urgent effort. These are people laid off, people who have been looking for work, people who cannot find work. For every job, at least five people are looking for employment for that job. I don't know what other evidence needs to be brought here. It can be stated very briefly and directly.

If the 2 million people who are going to lose their benefits looking for work were brought here so we could see them, would anyone vote “no”? Would anyone vote “no”? Do we need the 2 million here? Can we put ourselves in their homes, in their shoes, in their places with their families, with their children.

This is an emergency. This House must act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Mr. BOUSTANY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, well, as Yogi Berra said, This bill is like *deja vu* all over again—and not in a good way.

The bill before us today is the ninth extension of unemployment benefits since mid-2008. Benefits recently stretched up to 99 weeks, or almost 2 years, in most States. With the exception of just one bill last November, every one of those extensions was not paid for. That's a total of \$135 billion added to our \$14 trillion debt.

Meanwhile, our Democrat colleagues swore their policies would create jobs—but they haven't. Instead of paychecks, millions of Americans were left with only an unemployment check. In February 2009, the President signed the Democrats' trillion dollar stimulus plan. At that time, Democrats promised that the plan would create 3.7 million jobs and lower the unemployment rate to 7 percent by now. None of that happened.

Instead, over 2 million more private sector jobs were lost, and unemployment spiked to 10 percent while the debt has grown by almost \$3 trillion. A total of 48 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the Democrats' stimulus bill passed. Yet here we are again—extending unemployment benefits because the Democrats' trillion dollar stimulus failed to create the millions of jobs they promised it would. Even more sadly, instead of doing this responsibly, this bill will simply add another \$12 billion to our current mountain of debt.

We can do better than this. We certainly can do better than this.

Both Republicans and Democrats support helping the long-term unemployed. The chairman of the committee expressed a great deal of empathy in his opening statement. We share that empathy. Every one of our congres-

sional offices has dealt with families dealing with this tragedy of unemployment, but Republicans and even some Democrats want to responsibly pay for these benefits. In fact, there are sufficient unspent stimulus funds to do just that, to cover the \$12 billion cost of the bill before us. This is not a new Republican idea or a new idea. This is something we have discussed before, but the other side insists on bringing this forward, unpaid for.

The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has proposed cutting stimulus to pay for certain measures. Last June, the Democrat leader himself, Mr. HOYER, admitted there was spending fatigue across the country, and “if we have dollars not yet expended in the Recovery Act,” they should be “applied to” new spending like this. That would be far better than adding to the unchecked growth in spending and debt that has already cost us an estimated 1 million jobs.

The fact is we can both provide this help and pay for it by cutting less effective stimulus spending. That's what we should be debating today, not a bill called up under special rules that permit no amendments and no chance to offer ways to pay for this. Even if this were to pass, the sad thing is that there are no plans in the Senate for a vote on this bill any time soon. So the fact of the matter is this bill is going nowhere.

The American people know it isn't right to add these costs to our already overdrawn national credit card. We all want to help those in need, but the American people also know that someone has to pay when government spends money, and it shouldn't be our children and our grandchildren. The American people sent us here to do a job. We should pay for this spending today. We can pay for this spending today, and there is no reason why we couldn't bring a bill forward with a way to do this, with a way to pay for it.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this bill today. Instead, let's work together to quickly pass a bill to extend Federal unemployment benefits while finding a responsible way to pay for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the people of this country who are looking for work don't want empathy; they want the unemployment insurance that they worked for, and you're standing in the way. Don't send them empathy. Send them what they worked for.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be controlled by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the author of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, may I ask what the division of minutes is at the moment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 6419, which will extend current unemployment insurance benefits through February of next year and will provide much needed help to unemployed Americans during the holiday season.

From the beginning of the unemployment insurance program 75 years ago, we have never cut off benefits for out-of-work Americans when the unemployment rates have been this high. Without this extension, temporary Federal extended benefits will shut down shortly after Thanksgiving, the 27th, denying benefits to 2 million of our fellow citizens over the holiday season. It is unthinkable to me that we can allow these benefits to lapse during the holiday season and before the economic recovery is on solid ground.

Despite the severity of the Republican economic collapse, which started under Mr. Bush, there have been 10 straight months of private sector growth under this Democratically controlled Congress and administration. Despite the huge accomplishment of digging the American economy out of the Republican economic ditch, too many Americans remain unemployed. There is still only one available job for every five unemployed Americans. To make matters worse, the press is now carrying reports that employers around the country are refusing to hire the unemployed.

They're saying to the unemployed, We want to hire somebody who has a job to come over and fill our job because we know you were laid off because you weren't a good employee, and that's why they let you go. We don't want to hire people who aren't worth anything.

That's the message that's going out in this country now to the unemployed. Many of those people are middle class people who have worked very hard, and through no fault of their own, their industries have collapsed—banking, housing—as a direct result of what the Bush administration did—or didn't do, really, which is to have regulated Wall Street.

Unfortunately, the Republicans have already made it clear that, instead of helping the middle class, one of their top priorities is to give millionaires and billionaires a huge \$700 billion break. Now, the same people who are saying this should be paid for will be out on this floor sometime in the next couple of weeks, saying, We don't have to pay for a tax break. Why, that'll pump jobs into the world. All we have to do is cut taxes everywhere and give \$700 billion to people who make more than \$500,000 a year—that's okay—but

an unemployment check for somebody to keep bread on the table and keep a mortgage paid is not okay.

We can't not fund that. This is an emergency.

People who talk like that on the floor of this House have never been unemployed or have never known anybody who has been unemployed. You would not talk that way about unemployed people if you knew them.

Now, this should give every middle class American a lot to think about with the results of this last election. This is your first chance to observe what you can expect in the next 2 years. The minority leader in the other body said, My number one priority is to prevent Barack Obama from having a second term. Not public policy. Not jobs for people. Not health care for people—but political gain.

□ 1300

And that's what this is all about. The experts agree—two out of every three people who get unemployment benefits are in the middle class. We're not talking about people who weren't trying or weren't working or weren't doing their part as Americans.

While the Republicans were bankrupting the country to help the rich with one hand, giving tax breaks all over the place, the Republicans were using the other hand to push the unemployed middle class of America out of their homes and never dealt with the foreclosure issue to prevent them from having food on their tables and to keep their children from being properly clothed.

On the campaign trail Republicans called the unemployed "lazy." Boy, you haven't met an unemployed person or you would never say that a second time to them. And they said that unemployment benefits "spoil" out of work Americans. They get lazy and they just sit around the house and wait for their unemployment check. Those checks aren't that big in the first place, and secondly, people don't like to be unemployed in this country. People look for work, and they are looking for work and they are now being told you've been unemployed for 2 years, we're not interested in hiring you. We want somebody who's got a job over here. That was on NPR just yesterday. So it isn't made up. That's what's going on.

Some Republicans even question the constitutionality of the Unemployment Insurance Program. The health and welfare of the American people is unconstitutional, according to some people.

Fortunately, the American people don't feel the same way. A recent poll showed that 86 percent of Americans believe the unemployed really want to work. That's what the people think. That's not the political rhetoric of people running for election. That's what the people really think.

The election is over now, and Americans have said we want both parties to

work together to get things done and do it by listening to the American people. Americans don't want to push American families whose breadwinners lost their jobs through no fault of their own into poverty during the holidays.

I think we should end these debates and extend benefits longer and allow benefits to be scaled back as the economy improves. The reason we've had all these votes out here is because the Senate is unable to do anything. We've tried to extend this for extended periods of time, and over in the Senate, they say, well, let's extend it for a month, let's see if we can starve them for a month, and then we'll go in. They let this program lapse for 3 months over there, and you're telling me that we're going to work together. Well, I think we ought to work together.

This is a short-term extension in an effort to see if our Republican colleagues will support any kind of help for the unemployed. I am told by the other side that there's no plan in the Senate to take up this bill. Well, they're waiting to see if we can get it out of here. If you don't help, maybe it won't get out of here, but the message to 4 million Americans will be the Republican Party doesn't care whether you have a Christmas or a way to fund your mortgage or a way to put food on the table for the first three months of the next year. I hope my Republican colleagues will join the American people in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I just regret to say that we're hearing oversimplifications and many generalizations from the other side.

Look, this is not one of those you either pass it or you don't types of issues here. We could pay for this, and the sad thing is all I'm hearing on the other side is a great deal of cynicism. But furthermore, look, the American people have spoken about this, and they are saying we've got to get a handle on national debt if we're going to get the economy going again and create jobs because the American people want paychecks. They want good-paying jobs. They want an end to this uncertainty.

We have information from the MacArthur Foundation, a very respected organization. They released a poll showing that over 70 percent of voters in this month's election say it is very important to reduce the national debt. Overwhelmingly, voters want us to reduce the debt by cutting spending, but instead of doing this fiscally responsible thing and actually paying for this new spending, which we could very easily do, the bill before us today does exactly the opposite. It adds \$12 billion to our Nation's debt in a program that's already added \$135 billion to the national debt. The sad thing is, Madam Speaker, we could extend these unemployment benefits, and we could pay for them.

Look, the bill reflects I think a very cynical political maneuver by the Democratic leadership because they

know that the Senate has no plans to pass this unpaid-for bill. We've been down this path before, and in fact, the liberal Huffington Post has broken the code on really what's going on here. There was a recent headline, *Jobless Benefits About to Lapse as Senate Democrats Mull Strategy*. That was a headline on Tuesday. And, *No Plans in Senate For a Vote on Unemployment Benefits* read the headline yesterday. To quote Senator REED from Rhode Island, a Democratic leader on this legislation: "At this point it's not been scheduled. I can't point to a specific time it will come up for a vote this week."

The American people are tired of the cynicism. They want answers. And the sad thing is there's a simple answer on this one, unlike many of the other problems our country is facing which are more complex. We could extend unemployment benefits and we could pay for it, but our friends on the other side of the aisle currently control the House, they control the Senate, they control the White House, and they can't even get their act together to do this, especially when there are Republicans who would be willing to do this extension if it were paid for. The simple answer is "yes" there is a way to pay for it. It's staring us right in the face, and yet our friends across the aisle refuse to see this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

My friend on the other side clearly understands, I'm sure, the legislative process. We put a bill over to the Senate. They can make a change. If they want to pay for it, they can pay for it. They are safe, they're comfortable, because they know you're going to stop the bill or try to stop the bill. They know that the House Republicans are determined that they're not going to let this bill through here. So they say, all right, we can say we don't have any way to do anything with it. My belief is that we put a bill over there, they will pass a bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that the American people want to work. Those who are unemployed want a job. Those who are out of work want employment benefits. I don't think that there is any excuse that can be given. There is no reason that one can conjure up that would say to a person who's unemployed, out of work, has no food, can't pay their mortgage, can't enjoy the holidays, that there is a reason, especially since they have worked, that they can't have benefits to get them through this situation on an emergency basis.

I am amazed, I am dumbfounded, I can't believe that I'm hearing what I'm hearing, that somehow or another the Democrats, in a technical sense, are keeping individuals from getting unemployment benefits. I would hope

that we could change our minds, change our position, and know that when we do this for the least of these, then we're doing the work that we ought to be doing.

Let's pass this measure. Provide benefits to the unemployed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take this opportunity to remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I want to remind our friends on the other side that in the past when they did bring the bill up on suspension, it failed, and yet when you did on one occasion bring it up on regular order, it did pass.

We all have to work hard to listen to the will of the American people. Yesterday, Speaker PELOSI herself said, "Our consensus is that we go out there listening to the American people. It's about jobs. It's about reducing the deficit."

Yet today, here we are again being asked to increase the deficit by another \$12 billion. That's another \$160 in debt for every family of four in the United States, just for 3 months of benefits under one program, all on top of the \$2.8 trillion in debt we have racked up since President Obama took office, a 44 percent increase.

□ 1310

The question, Madam Speaker, is, Is the Speaker really listening to the American people? Because what we heard earlier this month is that people want us to provide help to those in need but not add to the mountain of debt that we are currently leaving to our children and grandchildren.

The sad thing—again, I repeat—the sad thing, we could have achieved both goals today. The Congressional Budget Office has informed us there is enough unspent stimulus spending that we can cut to cover the additional spending in this bill. It's just unconscionable that the other side has not heard the American people about the concerns about unfettered debt passed on to our children and grandchildren.

Again, Mr. HOYER this past summer suggested we do just that. In June he said, "If we have dollars not yet expended in the Recovery Act," that they should be "applied to" new spending like this. In July, 59 Democrats signed a letter saying: "Extending critical, economic investments is no more important than paying for them. America is facing a debt crisis that is threatening to undermine our economic and national security. We can no longer afford to exacerbate the problem because the decisions about how to pay for what we spend are getting harder."

This one is fairly easy. We have a way to pay for it, and yet the majority chose to bring this to the floor unpaid for, and without an opportunity to even offer an amendment.

So I ask our colleagues on the other side, Are you listening to the American

people? Madam Speaker, are they even listening to each other? And do they agree with the Speaker that it's about debt? All we're hearing are mixed signals. If so, join us in voting down this unpaid-for bill and begin working together on a new bill, which we could do very quickly, that does right by the unemployed as well as our children and our grandchildren. That's what the American people expect of us today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, could you tell us how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, released a report today that finds that if Congress fails to extend the Federal unemployment insurance benefits program, the unintended consequences could be extremely serious. Serious not just for the 2 million Americans who would see their benefits expire in December, but extremely serious for the larger economy as well.

Prematurely ending the program would drain our economy of some \$80 billion in purchasing power, just as our fragile economy is beginning to recover. This would result in the loss of over 1 million jobs over the next year. Even now, there are five Americans looking for work for every job opening in the land; and more than 40 percent of those unemployed have been out of work for 27 weeks or more, including over 159,000 in New York State, with some 95,000 in my home of New York City. Choosing to vote against an extension, and thus add a million Americans to the ranks of the unemployed, cannot possibly be considered as a wise economic policy choice.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office ranks the stimulative effects of unemployment benefits as one of the most effective policies to increase growth and employment that they have studied, and the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that every dollar spent on unemployment insurance benefits increases the gross domestic product by \$1.60. Economists predict that without extended benefits, the economy will suffer, consumer spending will fall by 0.5 percent, and economic growth will be reduced by almost 0.5 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. MALONEY. The facts and the numbers in the new JEC report make it clear that extending this program benefits those who need our help most, benefits the larger economy, and thus benefits us all.

I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again I say, there was a way to pay for this. We have to be frank with the American people on this. Jobless benefits have cost so far \$319 billion, and yet unemployment is still at 9.6 percent; and we've seen really nothing coming from the other side who has controlled the majority in the House, controlled the majority in the Senate, controlled the White House. We've seen nothing to help small businesses get going again to hire. We've seen nothing to promote competitiveness in the U.S. economy. Their answer is to continue to extend unemployment benefits unpaid for.

Now there's agreement. We're not disagreeing about extending the unemployment benefits at this time. We're saying, let's do it in a responsible way and pay for it.

It wasn't always this way. This is the ninth attempt to extend this program. And when Democrats passed their only paid-for unemployment insurance extender bill in November of 2009—the only one that was paid for—the Obama administration hailed that "fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits," adding that "fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs."

That was from the administration's statement of policy about the Democrats' one paid-for UI extension bill, which was H.R. 4548. There were 156 Republicans who supported that November 2009 bill.

By the administration's own logic, the Democrats' latest fiscally irresponsible bill, H.R. 6419, which increases the deficit by an estimated \$12 billion, undermines the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs. The sad thing, Madam Speaker, is this: we could extend unemployment benefits and pay for it. This is not a hard one. There are harder decisions coming with the debt that our country is facing and economic uncertainty. Republicans are ready to move forward and get this country going again and restore American competitiveness, but I see our friends on the other side of the aisle are up to their old ways.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have found that the other side is very adroit at finding some reason not to do anything to help the middle class. Now, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the people in this country are not interested in cutting off food and housing and medical coverage for people who are unemployed in this country. And to use these arguments about, Oh, we're going to get the money from the stimulus money, I defy anybody on this floor at this moment to stand up and tell me where that stimulus money is and what the impact would be if you cut it because that money was allocated to various agen-

cies, some to pay salaries for schoolteachers, some to pay salaries for policemen and firemen and local governments, some to pay the States for Medicaid.

All this money is out there. Maybe some of it hasn't yet been spent, but it's allocated. Some of it is for construction projects. I suppose, just like that Governor in New Jersey who thinks it's really politically smart to stop a public works project under the Hudson River because then he can use that money to pave potholes in New Jersey, and he puts the construction workers out of work all over the place.

□ 1320

Those infrastructure projects, you can't spend all the money on the first day. It does take a little while to build it, and you pay it out as you build it. Now, you know that. Republicans are just being deceptive. They think because it still is there in the Treasury, it can be used for something else. Well, it might have been committed for something else.

But not my Republican friends. This emergency that these 4½ million people have over here who have no benefits coming by the end of March, "You folks understand that you shouldn't worry about this. I mean, the Speaker will explain it to you that you just have to wait until we can find where that money is in the budget."

This is an emergency for people who have no check coming.

We would all like this thing to be all over. There isn't anybody on this floor, Republican or Democrat, who wouldn't like the mess that was created by the Bush administration to be over with. It isn't.

And the problem is, a guy in my district said, you know, JIM, I can tell you what the problem with America is, and your Republican side has a bad dose of this. He said, It's the belief in the microwave. If they have a problem, they come down to the refrigerator. They open the refrigerator, pull something out, close the refrigerator, open the microwave, throw it in, hit two buttons and wait 30 seconds and they've got lunch. They think everything can be solved like that.

It took a long time for Mr. Bush to create the mess that we are now dealing with, and it isn't going to be over in 30 seconds like the microwave dinner is.

And the fact is that you've got people who contradict you directly. The real budget—no one's going to ever accuse me of being a big budget warrior or a deficit warrior. I'm no deficit hawk. But Bob Bixby, President of the Concord Coalition, that organization dedicated to eliminating Federal budget deficits said, and I quote: "As a deficit hawk, I wouldn't worry about extending unemployment benefits. It is not going to add to the long-term structural deficit, and it does address a serious need. I just feel like unemployment benefits wandered into the wrong

street corner at the wrong time, and now they're getting mugged."

He's absolutely right. For us to pick on the unemployment benefits as the problem for this deficit, wait till we have the debate on taxes on this floor and I hear people whining and whining around here about people making more than half a million dollars and we've got to give them a tax cut.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 6419.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important legislation to extend unemployment benefits through February 2011.

We must continue to help families who are struggling to make ends meet. While we are continuing to see encouraging signs of economic recovery, the unemployment rate remains too high. If we do not extend emergency unemployment benefits, approximately two million Americans—including 14,600 Marylanders—will lose those benefits by the end of February.

Many Americans remain out of work through no fault of their own. Ending emergency unemployment assistance will not only be devastating for these individuals and their families, but it will also hurt the economy as a whole by undermining consumer confidence and demand. If individuals are unable to put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads, the entire economy could slip back into recession. In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office recently found that because unemployment benefits increase consumer demand and spending, previous extensions of unemployment insurance benefits increased both employment and job retention more than what it would have been otherwise in 2009.

The President and Congress have been working together to bring our economy back from the brink. However, there is much more work to do to create jobs and help put Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the extension of unemployment compensation. Indeed, there is no issue more important to our Nation right now than job creation. At a time when over 11 percent of Florida residents are desperately searching for employment and struggling to survive, it is simply mind blowing that we are not extending these benefits.

Never before has America turned its back on millions of American families as they struggled to make ends meet with this high level of unemployment. Yet the same Republicans, who want to increase our deficit by extending massive tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, were willing to leave average Americans to fend for themselves and vote against this bill.

Certainly, extending unemployment benefits is not only good for the unemployed; it is also one of the best and fastest ways to stimulate the economy. According to the Economic Policy Institute, unemployment benefits were responsible for creating more than 1 million jobs since the recession started, and adding almost 2 percent to the gross domestic product.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, it is with strong conviction that I urge my colleagues to support this short-term extension of

critical unemployment benefits for our citizens. As our Nation and my state continue to struggle out of this recession, this bill will provide vital assistance to almost 400,000 Illinoisans as we enter December. Failure to extend unemployment will directly affect approximately two million Americans, including 125,000 citizens from Illinois. If policymakers vote to block this critical lifeline, these 125,000 Illinoisans living in a state with a 10.8 percent unemployment rate will experience incredible hardship. Their time in unemployment has been difficult, trying to find work when the jobs are few and far between, trying to cover food, housing, and transportation for the families on an average of \$290 a week, which typically replaces only half of the average family's expenses.

A government is supposed to help its people in times of need. Failure to extend these benefits would be the first time since the unemployment program's inception that Congress allowed such critical aid to lapse when unemployment remained high for extended periods of time. It is not only these families who will suffer, it is our businesses. The retail sector has been hard hit by this recession. Cutting unemployment benefits for two million people will take a tremendous toll on these businesses as well.

In addition to this short-term extension, I strongly support determining ways to help those who remain unemployed beyond the 99 weeks currently covered. Long-term unemployment is an unfortunate reality for Chicago and for my constituents. Further, we should extend the TANF Emergency funds as well. This program directly helped over 26,000 individuals and close to 5,000 employers in Illinois by creating subsidized jobs program, a much-needed boost to the economy in the midst of the worst recession in decades. This program put \$9 million dollars into the pockets of hard working Illinoisans until Congress allowed it to lapse at the end of September.

Passing this bill today tells our citizens that we are working for them. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of extending emergency unemployment. This legislation, of which I am a proud cosponsor, is a common sense, non-controversial measure that will help American families.

The unemployment situation in our country is a national emergency. Over the past two years, millions of jobs have been lost as a result of the worst recession in 70 years, caused by Wall Street excesses and an unregulated housing market. Millions of Americans are unemployed today—but through no fault of their own. Our neighbors, our friends, and our families are the ones who agonize as the economy slowly recovers. We cannot afford to abandon the unemployed members of the American workforce, and I won't stand by silently and allow these lifelines to expire.

Unemployment benefits help millions of unemployed Americans help meet the basic needs of rent, food, and transportation while they search for jobs. Any family receiving unemployment insurance would tell you that these benefits do not provide for a luxurious lifestyle without financial worries. These same families would tell you that without these benefits, they will lose their home, lose their car, and lose the ability to feed their children. If the Federal Government does not assist these out-of-work Americans with emergency unem-

ployment compensation, then they will fall to the next level of the social safety net, requiring public housing assistance, seeking medical care in hospital emergency room, or turning to food shelves to put dinner on the table.

We have seen the proof that these benefits significantly stimulate economic growth while making the difference in the lives of struggling Americans. Economists from both sides of the aisle agree that unemployment benefits go directly into the economy, stimulating the kind of activity that creates jobs. And we have never before let federal emergency unemployment expire while the unemployment rate is anywhere close to this high.

I challenge my Republican colleagues who say this legislation is unaffordable to come to the floor right now and tell me how they can pay to give the richest 2 percent of Americans \$700 billion while holding this lifeline hostage. Every single vote against this extension is a vote to impoverish more American families. Every single vote against this legislation is a vote against economic growth. Every single vote against this bill is a vote against the middle class.

Our economy will recover. But until our economic growth is fully restored, I simply refuse to abandon America's families during their time of greatest need.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6419, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act.

Madam Speaker, 14.8 million Americans are unemployed. A majority of them are workers that endure historic long-term unemployment. Economist Heidi Shierholz of the Economic Policy Institute (EPI) estimated that at the current pace of job growth, it would take twenty years for the country to return to its pre-recession rate of unemployment. The American people cannot afford to wait another 20 years for the country to fully recover from the longest recession it has experienced in seventy years.

Some argue that passing unemployment benefits will add to the deficit and therefore should be opposed. Research tells us otherwise. EPI estimates that the effect of the \$65 billion spent on extending benefits through 2011 is actually "one of the most efficient things that can be done to create new jobs" and will increase the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by "an estimated \$104.7 billion." This increase in the GDP will translate into approximately a half-million jobs.

Madam Speaker, it would be a disgrace for Congress to adjourn for the Thanksgiving break without giving those who need our assistance the help they deserve. This is not a hand out. This is our responsibility.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the extension of emergency Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits for the millions of American workers who are unable to find work. If the incoming majority is committed to extending tax cuts to increase the wealth of millionaires, I certainly hope they are equally committed to helping Americans who have lost their jobs to stay in their homes and put food on their tables over the holidays.

UI benefits are a lifeline for millions of Americans. Allowing these benefits to expire at the end of the month would mean that two million people will lose their income, including over 450,000 in my State of California. These are people who want to work, but when there

are five applicants for every new job, the odds are against them. For these individuals, the recession has most definitely not ended.

People call my office every day worried about what will happen to them when they lose their unemployment benefits. As we approach the holiday season, we should not tell these individuals that their country will no longer support them in the midst of the worst economy since the Great Depression. We have never cut off support when the unemployment rate was this high. We must not begin now. Unemployment benefits kept 3.3 million Americans out of poverty in 2009, including almost 1 million children. UI benefits created two dollars of economic activity for every dollar spent in 2009. Extending benefits protects families and stimulates the growth of our economy.

Congress has a responsibility to protect families struggling to find work. H.R. 6419 is a chance for us to fulfill that responsibility. I urge all of my colleagues to side with American workers and support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act which would extend emergency unemployment compensation and other benefits through February 2011. Our government has always provided federal unemployment benefits during economic downturns until the job market has rebounded. If Congress does not act, over two million unemployed workers will lose their benefits this holiday season.

Today, unemployment levels are unacceptably high. In my home State of Michigan it is over 12 percent. In the past election, voters overwhelmingly cited the economy and job market as their highest concerns. It is highly ironic then that Republicans made electoral gains even though they have blocked multiple attempts to extend the unemployment benefits and many other job creating bills. Furthermore, Republicans oppose today's measure while providing unwavering support for permanent extension of Bush tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. Republicans are willing to give a helping hand to the rich while ignoring the taxpaying American worker. It should be clear to everyone where the Republican Party stands and who they will be willing to fight for.

Madam Speaker, with power comes responsibility. The Republicans won the election and now they have a responsibility to govern, instead of simply saying "no" over and over again. We simply cannot adjourn for Thanksgiving, a holiday that symbolizes gratitude and appreciation, while turning our back to our neighbors in need. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together in a show of compassion for our fellow citizens during this season of giving and support today's legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6419, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TELEWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will resume on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1721, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules with regard to H.R. 6419, S. 3774, H. Con. Res. 329, and H. Res. 1677.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 152, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—254

Ackerman	Castor (FL)	Driehaus
Adler (NJ)	Chandler	Edwards (MD)
Altmire	Childers	Edwards (TX)
Andrews	Chu	Ellison
Arcuri	Clarke	Ellsworth
Baca	Clay	Engel
Baird	Cleaver	Eshoo
Baldwin	Clyburn	Etheridge
Barrow	Cohen	Farr
Bean	Connolly (VA)	Fattah
Becerra	Conyers	Filner
Berkley	Cooper	Forbes
Berman	Costa	Fortenberry
Bilbray	Costello	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Fudge
Blumenauer	Crowley	Giffords
Bocciari	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Boren	Cummings	Gordon (TN)
Boswell	Dahlkemper	Grayson
Boucher	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Boyd	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Braley (IA)	Davis (TN)	Gutierrez
Bright	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Buchanan	DeGette	Halvorson
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hare
Cao	Dent	Harman
Capito	Deutch	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Dicks	Heinrich
Capuano	Dingell	Herseth Sandlin
Cardoza	Djou	Higgins
Carnahan	Doggett	Hill
Carney	Donnelly (IN)	Himes
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Hinchey

Hinojosa	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta
Hirono	McIntyre	Sarbanes
Hodes	McNerney	Schakowsky
Holt	Meek (FL)	Schauer
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Hoyer	Melancon	Schrader
Inslee	Michaud	Schwartz
Israel	Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Jackson Lee	Minnick	Serrano
(TX)	Mitchell	Sestak
Johnson (GA)	Molohan	Shea-Porter
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (KS)	Sherman
Jones	Moore (WI)	Shuler
Kagen	Murphy (CT)	Sires
Kanjorski	Murphy (NY)	Skelton
Kaptur	Nadler (NY)	Slaughter
Kildee	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)	Snyder
Kilroy	Nye	Speier
Kind	Obey	Spratt
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Oliver	Stark
Kissell	Ortiz	Stupak
Klein (FL)	Owens	Sutton
Kosmas	Pallone	Tanner
Kratovil	Pascarella	Taylor
Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)	Teague
Langevin	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Perriello	Tierney
LaTourette	Peters	Titus
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Tonko
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Polis (CO)	Tsongas
Lipinski	Pomeroy	Van Hollen
Loebuck	Quigley	Velázquez
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Visclosky
Lowey	Rangel	Walz
Lujan	Reichert	Wasserman
Lynch	Reyes	Schultz
Maffei	Richardson	Waters
Maloney	Rodriguez	Watt
Markey (CO)	Ross	Waxman
Markey (MA)	Rothman (NJ)	Weiner
Marshall	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Matheson	Ruppersberger	Wilson (OH)
Matsui	Rush	Wittman
McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
McCollum	Salazar	Woolsey
McCotter	Sanchez, Linda	Yarmuth
McDermott	T.	

NAYS—152

Aderholt	Gingrey (GA)	McKeon
Akin	Gohmert	McMorris
Alexander	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Austria	Granger	Mica
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)
Bartlett	Griffith	Miller, Gary
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Murphy, Tim
Berry	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Biggert	Harper	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Blackburn	Heller	Olson
Blunt	Hensarling	Paul
Boehner	Herger	Paulsen
Bonner	Hoekstra	Pence
Bono Mack	Holden	Petri
Boustany	Hunter	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Inglis	Platts
Burgess	Issa	Poe (TX)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Posey
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Putnam
Camp	Jordan (OH)	Rehberg
Campbell	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Cantor	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Castle	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Lance	Rooney
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Latta	Roskam
Conaway	Lee (NY)	Royce
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Scalise
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Dreier	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Emerson	E.	Shadegg
Flake	Mack	Shimkus
Fleming	Manzullo	Shuster
Fox	Manchant	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McCauley	Smith (NJ)
Garrett (NJ)	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Gerlach	McHenry	Stearns

Stutzman	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Sullivan	Turner	Wu
Terry	Upton	Young (AK)
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Young (FL)
Thornberry	Wamp	
Tiahrt	Whitfield	

NOT VOTING—27

Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Moran (VA)
Bilirakis	Duncan	Murphy, Patrick
Boozman	Fallin	Oberstar
Broun (GA)	Galleghy	Price (NC)
Brown (SC)	Garamendi	Radanovich
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy	Space
Brown-Waite,	Kirk	Watson
Ginny	Linder	Westmoreland
Coble	McMahon	
Davis (KY)	Moran (KS)	

□ 1352

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. CAPITO changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 578, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CONTINUATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6419) to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the further extension of emergency unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 154, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—258

Ackerman	Carney	Dent
Adler (NJ)	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Altmire	Castle	Diaz-Balart, L.
Andrews	Castor (FL)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Arcuri	Chandler	Dicks
Baca	Childers	Dingell
Baird	Chu	Doggett
Baldwin	Clarke	Donnelly (IN)
Barrow	Clay	Doyle
Bean	Cleaver	Driehaus
Becerra	Clyburn	Edwards (MD)
Berkley	Cohen	Edwards (TX)
Berman	Connolly (VA)	Ehlers
Bilbray	Conyers	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Ellsworth
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Engel
Blumenauer	Courtney	Eshoo
Bocciari	Critz	Etheridge
Boren	Crowley	Farr
Boswell	Cuellar	Fattah
Boucher	Cummings	Filner
Brady (PA)	Dahlkemper	Foster
Braley (IA)	Davis (AL)	Frank (MA)
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Capps	Davis (IL)	Garamendi
Capuano	DeFazio	Gerlach
Cardoza	DeGette	Giffords
Carnahan	DeLauro	Gonzalez

Gordon (TN) Maffei
 Grayson Maloney
 Green, Al Manzullo
 Green, Gene Markey (CO)
 Grijalva Markey (MA)
 Gutierrez Marshall
 Hall (NY) Matheson
 Halvorson Matsui
 Hare McCarthy (NY)
 Harman McCollum
 Hastings (FL) McCotter
 Heinrich McDermott
 Heller McGovern
 Herseth Sandlin McIntyre
 Higgins McNerney
 Himes Meek (FL)
 Hinchey Meeks (NY)
 Hinojosa Melancon
 Hirono Michaud
 Hodes Miller (NC)
 Holden Miller, George
 Holt Mitchell
 Honda Molohan
 Hoyer Moore (KS)
 Inslee Moore (WI)
 Israel Murphy (CT)
 Jackson (IL) Murphy (NY)
 Jackson Lee Murphy, Patrick
 (TX) Murphy, Tim
 Johnson (GA) Nadler (NY)
 Johnson (IL) Napolitano
 Johnson, E. B. Neal (MA)
 Jones Oberstar
 Kagen Obey
 Kanjorski Olver
 Kaptur Ortiz
 Kildee Owens
 Kilpatrick (MI) Pallone
 Kilroy Pascarell
 Kind Pastor (AZ)
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Payne
 Kissell Pelosi
 Klein (FL) Perlmutter
 Kosmas Perriello
 Kratovil Peters
 Kucinich Pingree (ME)
 Langevin Platts
 Larsen (WA) Polis (CO)
 Larson (CT) Pomeroy
 LaTourette Posey
 Lee (CA) Price (NC)
 Levin Quigley
 Lewis (GA) Rahall
 Lipinski Rangel
 LoBiondo Reichert
 Loeb sack Reyes
 Lofgren, Zoe Richardson
 Lowey Rodriguez
 Lujan Ros-Lehtinen

NAYS—154

Aderholt Bono Mack
 Akin Boustany
 Alexander Boyd
 Austria Brady (TX)
 Bachmann Bright
 Bachus Broun (GA)
 Bartlett Buchanan
 Barton (TX) Burgess
 Berry Burton (IN)
 Biggert Buyer
 Bilirakis Calvert
 Bishop (UT) Camp
 Blackburn Campbell
 Blunt Cantor
 Boehner Cao
 Bonner Capito

Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Guthrie
 Hall (TX)
 Harper
 Hastings (WA)
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hill
 Hoekstra
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan (OH)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline (MN)
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (NY)
 Lewis (CA)

Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Marchant
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Minnick
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Olson
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Price (GA)
 Putnam
 Rehberg
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Roskam
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Stearns
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Taylor
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Upton
 Walden
 Wamp
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Barrett (SC)
 Boozman
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite
 Ginny
 Coble
 Davis (KY)
 Delahunt
 Duncan
 Fallin
 Gallegly
 Kennedy
 Kirk
 Linder
 Lynch
 McMahon
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Radanovich
 Space
 Terry
 Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1401

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 579 I was unavoidably delayed. Had I voted, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unable to participate in a series of votes on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 578, on the motion to agree to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722, I would have voted “aye” on the question.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 579, on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H.R. 6419, I would have voted “aye” on the question.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, November 5, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Todd D. Valentine and Mr. Robert A. Brehm, Co-Executive Directors of the New York State Board of Elections, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 2, 2010, the Honorable Tom Reed was elected Representative to Congress for the Twenty-Ninth Congressional District, State of New York.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
 STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
 Albany, NY, November 5, 2010.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MILLER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, November 2, 2010, for Representative in Congress from the Twenty-Ninth Congressional District of New York, show that Thomas W. Reed, II received 96,078 and that Matthew C. Zeller received 73,498 of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Thomas W. Reed, II was elected as Representative in Congress from the Twenty-Ninth Congressional District of New York.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as official results are certified to this office by all county boards in the Twenty-Ninth Congressional District in New York involved, an official Certification of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BREHM.
 TODD D. VALENTINE.

29th CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT UNEXPIRED TERM

County	Matthew C. Zeller	Thomas W. Reed, II	Thomas W. Reed, II	Thomas W. Reed, II	Matthew C. Zeller	Blank	Void	Scattering	BVS Subtotal	Total
	DEM	REP	IND	CON	WOR					
Allegany	3,287	6,274	255	564	343	0	0	0	0	10,723
Cattaraugus	6,117	9,654	619	1,276	667	0	0	0	0	18,333
Chemung	8,978	10,062	459	865	683	0	0	0	0	21,047
Schuyler	1,975	2,925	0	399	295	0	0	0	0	5,594
Steuben	9,630	12,197	496	1,149	975	0	0	0	0	24,447
Yates	2,360	2,842	137	384	232	0	0	0	0	5,955
Part of Monroe	28,127	27,114	2,097	5,367	2,143	0	0	0	0	64,848
Part of Ontario	7,219	9,154	503	1,286	467	0	0	0	0	18,629
Total	67,693	80,222	4,566	11,290	5,805	0	0	0	0	169,576
RECAP	73,498	96,078								

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE TOM REED, OF NEW YORK, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, the Honorable TOM REED, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect REED and the members of the New York delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. REED appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 111th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE TOM REED TO THE HOUSE OF REP- RESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I can't imagine an any more delicate moment to be sworn into Congress than when 434 Members are looking to leave, but if anyone is prepared for it, it is TOM REED.

TOM REED is well prepared to be in the House of Representatives. He was raised with 11 other children. He knows what turbulence is all about, and he is extremely, extremely well qualified. He is a former practicing attorney, a businessman, a mayor, and an absolutely dedicated man in his community. He is a good friend of all of ours and of Amo Houghton's.

He is here today with his wife, Jean, and with his children, Will and Autumn—beautiful children, a beautiful family.

Without any further adieu, I am really proud and privileged to present to you the newest Congressman from the State of New York, Mayor TOM REED.

Mr. REED. I thank you, Madam Speaker, for welcoming me to this Chamber, and thank you, Congressman KING, for introducing me to the House.

I would like to thank my wife, Jean; my children, Autumn and Will; and my

family and friends. Without them, I would not be here.

I would also like to look to Heaven and hope my mother and father are proud and will guide me and us in this new endeavor.

As we begin this journey, the time for talk has come and gone. The campaigns are over, and the American people have spoken. Now is the time for service.

And though we may have our differences, let us invoke the spirit of those who stood in this very Chamber to solve the perils of our Nation's past and, through our vigorous debate, complete our work so our Nation will rise to a greatness not yet seen on the face of the Earth. Our debate should always be dynamic, and while we may disagree at times, we shall at all times conduct ourselves with humility and civility toward all.

Though we may appear on occasion to be rivals in this Chamber, I pledge to you and let us always remember and pledge to each other that we are forever countrymen, who proudly swear allegiance to our flag and will forever stand united against all enemies, foreign and domestic, so help us God.

Finally, it is with great pride that I join this institution thanks to the people of New York's 29th Congressional District. Over the last 2 years, I have heard your concerns, and I will represent you with all my heart, all my mind, and all my soul. I promise to serve you with dignity and dedication as we restore the opportunity for success that every American deserves.

Thank you, and I am so proud to call each and every one of you friends and colleagues.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from New York, the whole number of the House is 435.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3774) to extend the deadline for Social Services Block Grant expenditures of supplemental funds appropriated following disasters occurring in 2008, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 40, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—366

Ackerman	Doyle	Lee (NY)
Aderholt	Dreier	Levin
Adler (NJ)	Driedhaus	Lewis (CA)
Akin	Edwards (MD)	Lewis (GA)
Alexander	Edwards (TX)	Lipinski
Altmire	Ehlers	LoBiondo
Andrews	Ellison	Loebsack
Austria	Ellsworth	Loftgren, Zoe
Baca	Emerson	Lowe
Bachmann	Engel	Lucas
Bachus	Eshoo	Luetkemeyer
Baldwin	Etheridge	Lujan
Barrow	Farr	Lummis
Bartlett	Fattah	Lungren, Daniel
Barton (TX)	Filner	E.
Becerra	Fleming	Lynch
Berkley	Forbes	Maffei
Berman	Fortenberry	Maloney
Berry	Foster	Manzullo
Biggert	Frank (MA)	Marchant
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	Markey (CO)
Bilirakis	Fudge	Markey (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	Marshall
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	Matheson
Bishop (UT)	Giffords	Matsui
Blackburn	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Blunt	Goodlatte	McCauley
Boccheri	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Boehner	Granger	McCotter
Bonner	Graves (MO)	McDermott
Bono Mack	Grayson	McGovern
Boren	Green, Al	McIntyre
Boswell	Green, Gene	McKeon
Boucher	Grijalva	McMorris
Boustany	Guthrie	Rodgers
Boyd	Gutierrez	McNerney
Brady (PA)	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Braley (IA)	Halvorson	Melancon
Bright	Hare	Mica
Buchanan	Harman	Michaud
Burton (IN)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)
Butterfield	Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)
Calvert	Heinrich	Miller, George
Camp	Heller	Minnick
Cantor	Hensarling	Mitchell
Cao	Herse, Sandlin	Mollohan
Capito	Higgins	Moore (KS)
Capps	Hill	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Himes	Murphy (CT)
Cardoza	Hinchey	Murphy, Patrick
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Murphy, Tim
Carney	Hirono	Myrick
Carson (IN)	Hodes	Nadler (NY)
Carter	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Cassidy	Holden	Neal (MA)
Castle	Holt	Neugebauer
Castor (FL)	Honda	Nunes
Chandler	Hoyer	Nye
Childers	Inglis	Oberstar
Chu	Inslee	Obey
Clarke	Israel	Olson
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Ortiz
Clyburn	(TX)	Owens
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cole	Johnson (IL)	Pascarelli
Conaway	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Conyers	Jones	Paulsen
Costa	Kagen	Payne
Costello	Kanjorski	Pence
Courtney	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Crenshaw	Kennedy	Perriello
Critz	Kildee	Peters
Crowley	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pitts
Cuellar	Kilroy	Platts
Culberson	Kind	Poe (TX)
Cummings	King (IA)	Polis (CO)
Dahlkemper	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Posey
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Quigley
DeFazio	Kline (MN)	Rahall
DeGette	Kosmas	Rangel
DeLauro	Kratovil	Reed
Dent	Kucinich	Rehberg
Deutch	Lance	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Reyes
Diaz-Balart, M.	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Dingell	Latham	Roe (TN)
Djou	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Doggett	Latta	Rogers (MI)
Donnelly (IN)	Lee (CA)	Rohrabacher

Rooney	Shuler	Turner
Roskam	Shuster	Upton
Ross	Sires	Van Hollen
Rothman (NJ)	Skelton	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Rush	Smith (TX)	Walz
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wamp
Ryan (WI)	Snyder	Wasserman
Salazar	Space	Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Waters
Sarbanes	Spratt	Watson
Scalise	Stark	Watt
Schakowsky	Stupak	Waxman
Schauer	Sullivan	Weiner
Schiff	Tanner	Welch
Schmidt	Taylor	Whitfield
Schock	Teague	Wilson (OH)
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Wittman
Scott (GA)	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Scott (VA)	Thornberry	Woolsey
Serrano	Tiberi	Wu
Sessions	Tierney	Yarmuth
Sestak	Titus	Young (AK)
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Young (FL)
Sherman	Towns	
Shimkus	Tsongas	

NAYS—40

Arcuri	Graves (GA)	Murphy (NY)
Baird	Harper	Peterson
Bean	Herger	Petri
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Price (GA)
Campbell	Issa	Royce
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Coffman (CO)	Jordan (OH)	Shadegg
Cooper	Kingston	Simpson
Davis (TN)	Lamborn	Stearns
Flake	Mack	Stutzman
Fox	McClintock	Tiahrt
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Westmoreland
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)	
Gingrey (GA)	Moran (VA)	

NOT VOTING—28

Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Pingree (ME)
Boozman	Duncan	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Fallin	Radanovich
Brown, Corrine	Gallely	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Griffith	Ros-Lehtinen
Ginny	Kirk	Sánchez, Linda
Burgess	Linder	T.
Buyer	McMahon	Slaughter
Coble	Miller, Gary	Sutton
Davis (KY)	Moran (KS)	Terry

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1417

Messrs. ROYCE and MCHENRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, during debate on H.R. 1722, H.R. 6419 and S. 3774, I was unavoidably detained, and unable to make the votes. Had I been present, I would have voted the following: rollcall No. 578, “yes”; rollcall 579, “yes”; rollcall 580, “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, November 18, 2010, I was unable to participate in all of the day's votes due to a family emergency. Had I been present I

would have voted: On rollcall No. 576—“no”—on ordering the previous question—H. Res. 1722, providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722, the Telework Enforcement Act; on rollcall No. 577—“no”—on agreeing to the resolution—H. Res. 1722, providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722, the Telework Enhancement Act; on rollcall No. 578—“no”—H.R. 1722, Telework Improvements Act; On rollcall No. 579—“no”—H.R. 6419, Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act; on rollcall No. 580—“yes”—S. 3774, to extend the deadline for Social Services Block Grant expenditures of supplemental funds appropriated following disasters occurring in 2008.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 329, RECOGNIZING 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays be vacated with respect to the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Concurrent Resolution 329 to the end that the motion be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Tuesday, November 16, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 1677, CONDEMNING BURMESE REGIME'S UNDEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays be vacated with respect to the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 1677 to the end that the motion be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Wednesday, November 17, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: “Condemning the Burmese regime's undemocratic elections on November 7, 2010.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1420

UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), as amended, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, effective January 1, 2011:

Mr. Michael Wessel, Falls Church, Virginia.

REPEAL FORM 1099 REQUIREMENT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration's chief counsel for advocacy, Winslow Sargeant, testified today in the Senate that the form 1099 requirement of the health care bill should be repealed. As a cosponsor of H.R. 5141, a bill by Congressman DAN LUNGREN to repeal that section, this was music to my ears.

In his testimony before the Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, Sargeant said, “The form 1099 requirement will greatly increase the reporting and recordkeeping burdens on small businesses.” As part of the health care bill, this section requires small businesses to issue an Internal Revenue Service form 1099 to any individual or corporation from which they purchase more than \$600 in goods or services. Mr. Sargeant went on to cite a recent study by his office that indicated that firms with fewer than 20 employees pay \$10,585 per employee on average to comply with Federal regulations. And we wonder why small businesses aren't hiring.

It's time to repeal this burden and to work to get government regulations off the backs of our job creators. The true economic stimulus is the small businesses of this Nation, and they need our help.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF LIEUTENANT BRENDAN LOONEY AND LANCE CORPORAL TERRY HONEYCUTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a sad occasion, but an appropriate occasion. I rise to pay tribute to two proud natives of Maryland who lost their lives in Afghanistan this fall, Navy Lieutenant Brendan Looney of Owings and Marine Lance Corporal Terry Honeycutt of Waldorf. I attended both of their burials at Arlington Cemetery. As I say, it was a mixture of deep sadness to lose these two young, extraordinarily capable, patriotic Americans, to be with their families, to learn what committed young men they were. At the same time, to be filled with pride that America has people like these two brave souls, willing to give their lives in the defense of freedom and justice and democracy and the safety and security of our people. I know that the grief their family feels is still fresh and that nothing can replace the loss they have suffered. But I want them to know the honor and awe in which we hold their sons' sacrifices.

Now it is our responsibility to keep their names, their memories, and their examples alive. Lieutenant Looney, a 29-year-old Navy SEAL, died with nine other American servicemembers in a helicopter crash in southern Afghanistan. Most of you read about that incident. He was a star lacrosse player at the Naval Academy and then chose to complete the grueling training required to become a Navy SEAL. Lieutenant Looney was recognized as the Honor Man, or top member of his SEAL class. And just 48 hours after marrying his wife, Amy, he deployed to Iraq. He served four deployments, four deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan and tragically died just 2 weeks before he was to return home from that fourth deployment. He is buried next to his Naval Academy roommate and best friend, First Lieutenant Travis Manion, who died in Iraq in 2007.

Lance Corporal Honeycutt, the other young man to whom I referred, died at the age of 19 in the blast of an improvised explosive device in Helmand province, Afghanistan. As long as his parents could remember, their son wanted to be a marine. He stood out for his commitment in his high school Junior ROTC program, and on graduating, he met his goal. Sadly, his life was cut far too short. But all those who remember Lance Corporal Honeycutt speak of a man who lived to serve his country and who embodied the marines' deepest ideals of service, sacrifice, and inner strength.

□ 1430

In the words of his mother Christine, whom I talked to Monday this week, "We have so much honor and pride and

joy, knowing that he was the person that he was, and I can't describe," she went on, "how proud we are of him. We knew him as the type of person that was ready, willing, and waiting to do anything for anybody."

He did that for his country, for all of us who serve in this Chamber, for every one of our fellow citizens.

These two irreplaceable lives are among the latest costs of a war that has lasted more than 9 years. This is not the time or place to speak about that war's future or its end.

But I ask my colleagues only this: We must remember that its costs are measured in lives like Brendan's and Terry's, and treat every debate and every decision about this war with a gravity that honors those two souls and the souls who have also been lost and who currently serve.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my deep sympathy for the families who have lost so much: To Lieutenant Looney's wife, Amy; to his parents, Kevin and Maureen; to his brothers, Billy and Steve; and to his sisters, Erin, Kellie and Briget; and to Lance Corporal Honeycutt's parents, Terry and Christine; his sister, Dawn; and to his sister's husband, who currently serves as a member of the United States Marines; and to all the grandparents, great-grandparents, aunts, and uncles whom we join in mourning the loss of these two brave, patriotic, extraordinary Americans. May God rest their souls and give strength and peace to their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey) addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE "START" OF MORE OBSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the 111th Congress has been an astounding success, but throughout the last 2 years, when we have failed to pass good laws, it's usually because our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol have stood in the way of our progress, proudly engaging in stubborn obstructionism.

The Senate is where good legislation goes to die. So I guess we shouldn't be surprised that it remains so right down to the final days of our session.

It appears now that there may not be enough Republican votes to ratify the New START Treaty, which would make huge strides towards reducing the threat of nuclear destruction.

This is distressing news, Mr. Speaker. After years of negligence on nuclear issues, the New START could finally put us on a course toward the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons. It would drastically reduce the size of nuclear arsenals here in the United States and in Russia. It would improve our access to Russian nuclear facilities, which we've been unable to inspect since the expiration of the original START treaty nearly a year ago. And it would put our relationship with Russia on more solid footing, enhancing bilateral cooperation on a host of issues.

In the words of the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. KERRY, he said, and I quote him: "Ratifying New START is not a political choice; it's a national security imperative."

But apparently, Mr. Speaker, some over in the other Chamber aren't moved by national security imperatives. For them, 1,550 strategic warheads, the level mandated by New START, isn't a sufficient arsenal, even though 1,550 strategic warheads is enough to blow up the world several times over. The only way they know to deal with national security, it appears, is to send thousands of American troops to die in failed wars that carry a combined price tag of over \$1 trillion.

New START isn't perfect. I wish it were less incremental and more ambitious. I wish it embraced more of the principles contained in my resolution, which is called "Nonproliferation Options for Nuclear Understanding to Keep Everyone Safe," or "NO NUKES" for short. NO NUKES would move more aggressively toward complete nuclear global disarmament, which was exactly the long-term goal we committed to as a Nation when we signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty 40 years ago.

But New START is most definitely consistent with the SMART Security platform I laid out from this podium so many times, Mr. Speaker. Specifically, it advances the idea that we make the world safer, not through violence, not through acts of war and weapons escalation, but through diplomacy, cooperation, and conflict resolution.

New START is good enough as a first step. It's good enough for the top military brass, past and present, who have endorsed it. It's good enough for leading foreign policy dignitaries from across the political spectrum. The only holdouts are a minority of Senators who seem more interested in embarrassing the President on the international stage than they are in a major international security breakthrough.

Concessions have been made to these lawmakers. Their opinions have been heard, their concerns addressed. Now it's time for action. For the safety of the American people and possibly for the future of human civilization, it is time to pass New START.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF CONSTANTINO DELSIGNORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary life of Constantino DelSignore and mourn his sudden passing at the age of 47.

Born on December 2, 1962, Tino DelSignore graduated from Detroit Catholic Central High School in 1980. He immersed himself in the DelSignore family's businesses, the Fonte D'Amore restaurant and the Laurel Manor.

Tino dedicated his life to serving our community through many philanthropic efforts. He was founder of CDS Foundation, cofounder of the Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Foundation, as well as being an advocate for many other local, national, and international humanitarian causes.

Tino committed his considerable efforts to Angela Hospice, the Aliaga Foundation, the Barbara Ann Karmanos Cancer Institute, St. Mary's Mercy Hospital's Our Lady of Hope Cancer Center, Botsford Hospital Foundation, the McCarty Foundation, Madonna University, Hunters Feeding the Homeless, the Livonia Italian American Club, Hockey Has Hearts, and numerous veterans' organizations and Rotarian organizations. Tino DelSignore gave with an open heart and, like the entire DelSignore family, was always willing to help.

Regrettably, on October 26, 2010, Tino passed from this earthly world to his eternal reward. He is survived by his beloved son, Giovanni, and his parents, John and Lina. A devoted brother to Luciano, Nancy, and Renata, Tino leaves a legacy in his nieces and nephews: Ryder, Caprice, Coco, Alexa, Olivia, Alexandria, and Max.

If, in the end, a person's wealth can be measured by the lives he has touched, Constantino DelSignore went home to God a very wealthy man. Courageous and honorable, Tino will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, Constantino DelSignore is remembered as a compassionate father, a dedicated son, a treasured brother, a caring leader, and a true friend. Tino was a man who deeply treasured his family, friends, community, and country. Today, as we bid Constantino DelSignore farewell, I ask my colleagues to join me in mourning his passing and honoring his unwavering patriotism and legendary service to our country and community.

□ 1440

TAX CUTS FOR THE RICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am returning to a subject that I began yesterday. This is the second episode of

what the rich are going to do with all those tax cuts that the Republicans want to give to them through extending the Bush tax cuts for the rich in lieu of the Obama tax cuts for the middle class.

As I said yesterday with regard to the 1 percent top income group in this country, the high and mighty who earn more than \$1.3 million a year in taxable income, according to the Republican plan each one of them will receive a tax cut, every single year, of \$83,347 each year.

I have given a lot of thought to what they are going to do with that money. I made some suggestions yesterday, and here are some more suggestions about what they could possibly do with this windfall that the Republicans want to hand to them at a time when this country has 9.5 percent unemployment, 40 million people who cannot see a doctor when they are sick, and so many people who are in danger of losing their homes.

For instance, the rich, the idle rich, the high and mighty, the ruling class, they can buy three tickets to the most expensive suite at the Super Bowl. That costs only \$75,000. They will have \$12,000 left over in pocket change.

Here is something else that they might do with the windfall that the Republicans want to give them. They can go to the top of Mount Everest. That costs only \$65,000, a luxury climb to the top of Mount Everest, with somebody holding your bag for you the whole way up. Just one thing: Make sure you don't fall down.

Here is something else that they can do with the Republican tax plan to give \$87,000 a year to the rich. They can take a beautiful 110-day cruise around the world. That costs only \$80,000. And it is up to them what they do with the other 250 days a year, but think about that. Think about people in the middle class who struggle, save for vacation year after year, and sometimes occasionally get to go on a 3- or 4- or even a 5-day cruise. With the Republican tax cut for the rich, the millionaires can go on a 110-day luxury cruise, not just 1 year, but every single year.

Here is something else that they can do. They can enjoy two nights at the Hugh Hefner SkyVilla at the Palms Casino Resort in Las Vegas. That costs only \$80,000. They will have \$7,000 left over for tipping the bellman. And remember, what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas.

As I pointed out yesterday, the Republicans want to stuff so much money into the pockets of rich people in this country, the millionaires, the people who make an average of \$1.3 million a year, that every single one of them, every single one of them every year for the next 10 years will be able to enjoy a luxury cigar in the morning and a luxury cigar in the evening as well, and they can light each one of those cigars with a \$100 bill.

Now, I don't know about you, but I'm not sure that that's the best use of \$100

billion a year of tax money. I have some other ideas about what I would like to see happen. I would like to see jobs, jobs, and more jobs.

If you do the arithmetic, you will find that the \$100 billion a year that the Republicans want to hand over to the rich so that they can further comfort the comfortable, that could be used instead to provide a decent job, a job with a living wage, a decent day's pay for a decent day's work to 3 million Americans, and, in a single stroke, could reduce unemployment in this country from 9 percent to 7 percent; but, more importantly, take that \$100 billion and make sure it actually circulates in the economy. Because what will the rich do with it? They'll keep it in their pockets; or they'll send it abroad buying luxury goods like we discussed yesterday, or they'll take a cruise around the world that adds nothing to the American economy. But if you actually did take that money and you created 3 million jobs at \$30,000 a year for the American people, then you would see our economy revive overnight.

When it comes down to my vote for tax cuts for the rich versus jobs, I'm going to vote for jobs.

MR. AILES SHOULD APOLOGIZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Roger Ailes, the president of Fox News, decided that there were Nazis running around a competitor news organization. He called the executives at National Public Radio "Nazis." He said, and I quote, "They are of course Nazis. They have a kind of Nazi attitude. They are the left wing of Nazism. These guys don't want any other point of view."

Mr. Ailes also said, after a diatribe against President Obama and against Jon Stewart of Comedy Central, and I quote, "There are left-wing rabbis who basically don't think that anybody can use the word 'Holocaust' on the air."

Mr. Speaker, I find those words to be very offensive and inappropriate. Relatives of mine were among the millions of Jews and others who died in the Holocaust. At the hands of the Nazis, acts of brutality and mass murder were carried out, the likes of which the world had never seen.

If Mr. Ailes is the president of Fox News and claims to be fair and balanced, he should keep his comments to himself. If he wants to be a commentator, then he should be so. But if he wants to pretend to be a so-called fair and balanced president of a major news organization, he ought to know better than to utter such hateful words.

To use the word "Holocaust" in the same sentence that he uses the word "rabbi," although he clearly meant rabbi in another connotation, is doubly offensive. And to use the word "Holo-

caust" cavalierly to connote any situation in which somebody or some group feels aggrieved is offensive again.

Mr. Ailes should apologize for these despicable statements of total insensitivity that should not be connected to a president of a major news organization.

Later today, I will send him a letter demanding that he retract and apologize for these despicable statements.

AMERICA'S THIRD WAR: TEXAS STRIKES BACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there was an article, I guess it's on FoxNews.com, today, and it's called "America's Third War: Texas Strikes Back." Captain Stacy Holland with the Texas Department of Public Safety said, "I never thought that we would be in this paramilitary type of engagement. It's a war on the border."

It's a war on the border. That border is 1,980 miles long, and the President sent 1,200 National Guard people down there. Now, I don't know how many that is per mile, but it ain't much. And now I understand, from information I got today, that they're going to withdraw some of those because of the cost.

Now, they sent 17,000 National Guard troops down when they had the oil spill in the Gulf. Granted, that was a real problem. But the border between us and Mexico is a war zone, a war zone, according to the Texas Department of Public Safety.

□ 1450

I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, some of the things he said. He said, they—the terrorists, drug dealers, people who are kidnapping people—"They cross the border with AK-47s on their backs, wearing military camouflage. They recruit in prisons and schools on the American side. Spotters"—people from Mexico—"sit in duck blinds along the Rio Grande and call out the positions of the U.S. Border Patrol." And they do that on the American side.

"To combat the cartels, the Texas Department of Public Safety is launching a counterinsurgency. Tactical strike teams send field intelligence they gather to Austin to a joint operation intelligence center, or JOIC in military terminology. 'It certainly is a war in a sense that we're doing what we can to protect Texans and the rest of the Nation from clearly a threat that has emerged over the last several years,' said former FBI prosecutor Steve McCraw, who runs the undeclared 'war.'"

"And now that there is added pressure on the cartels, the drug runners are employing new techniques, known as a splash down. When the heat is on, they attempt to return to Mexico with the drugs, oftentimes in broad daylight. And because the Texas law en-

forcement's authority ends at the border—in this case the river—they even have time to put on their life jackets."

I don't understand why this White House doesn't understand that this is a war on our border, our front yard. And in Arizona they have signs that say—80 miles into the United States in Arizona—they say don't go south of here because it's not safe. In the United States. And the President sent 1,200 National Guard troops down there, and they are withdrawing some of them.

I just don't understand this White House. I understand that we have to deal with Afghanistan and Iraq and other places around the world. But this is our front yard. And they are withdrawing. They sent 17,000 down to the Gulf oil spill, and they send 1,200 down there to the border, which is nothing, and now they are withdrawing some of them.

The former FBI agent goes on to say, "The cartels may be ruthless, they may be vicious, they may be cowardly, but they're not stupid. They'll adapt their tactics, and recently they've adapted their tactics to utilize smaller loads, cross with rafts, stolen vehicles on our side.

"President Barack Obama and Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano have recently said the Mexican border is more secure now than it has been in 20 years."

I want to tell you, that is such bull. That is just bull. I can't say that the President of the United States is misleading the people. But, boy, that sure ain't the truth. And if you don't believe that, talk to Congressman Poe from Texas and some of the others from Arizona. Instead of doing what they can to protect American citizens to stop this flood of drugs coming in as well as illegal aliens and others, they are suing the State of Arizona because they say they are trampling on Federal statutes.

I tell you, I just can't understand this administration. We are talking about the safety of the United States, and in particular all the people who live on the Texas border, the Arizona border and the New Mexico border. This is something that's unforgivable. And if I were talking to the President, I would say, Mr. President, wake up. This is the American citizens you're supposed to protect. Let's get on with the job.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 2010

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, November 22, 2010, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 332, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. Alfredo A. Sandoval, Indian Wells, California.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have long appreciated the honor to serve the people of western Iowa here in the United States Congress. Each one of us carries this duty with us in a heavy way and also sometimes in a jubilant way depending on the cycles of the day and the cycles of the elections.

I sat here on the floor tonight, and I listened to the presentation of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). He talked about the situation on the border between Texas and Mexico, Arizona and Mexico, and perhaps also New Mexico versus Mexico, California, and Mexico. There are a whole lot of data points that he rolled out here. And I believe that there is a misunderstanding on the part of the American people of the magnitude of the border problem that we have.

I make a number of trips down to that border. I think it's my obligation to do that. I have served on the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee now for 8 years. And if all goes well, I will be able to serve on the committee for another cycle. In that period of time, you pick up a significant amount of knowledge about the circumstances that have to do with immigration. And the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) talked about how illegal Mexican drug smuggler gangs are controlling vast areas of the border, some might argue a majority of the border or perhaps even all of the border, with the exception of some ports of entry, and controlling vast parts of the United States itself.

I have been down to visit Oregon Pipe Cactus National Monument. It is a national park right on the border. And a large percentage of Oregon Pipe Cactus has been set aside, and Americans have been locked out and kept out because the illegal border-crossers and the drug smugglers command some of that park. A large share of it, mile after mile of it, is under control of the Mexican drug smugglers and people smugglers.

And we think that a sovereign nation should have no border incursion. If we have a border incursion, and if it's

someone who is lined up next to someone else lined up next to someone else and they are carrying weapons and in uniforms, it is called an invasion. Whether they are wearing uniforms and carrying weapons or whether they are coming across in orderly ranks or whether they are coming across at a rate of perhaps as many as 11,000 a night—and that's some data that came before the House Immigration Subcommittee under sworn testimony—you take the annual illegal border crossings and you divide it by 365, and some of that data under oath calculates out to be 11,000 illegal border crossings in a 24-hour period. A lot of that takes place at night. Think of that: 11,000 a night.

And so I ask the question, what was the size of Santa Anna's army? About half that. That, Mr. Speaker, is the magnitude of the illegal border crossings that we are seeing.

And the price that we have to pay in the form of social services, law enforcement, education, and health services is in the billions of dollars in costs to the American taxpayer. And the price and loss because of the result of crimes that could otherwise have been prevented is awesome beyond our comprehension.

I do have some numbers on that. I'm hopeful that I will be able to produce a fresh report very soon that would better illustrate the numbers of Americans who have lost their lives at the hands of those who came into the United States illegally.

That is a real measure to American society. Every life is precious, every life is sacred, and every one that we can save should be saved. And you do so with an orderly society and the rule of law. You don't do so by allowing for vast areas of the 2,000-mile southern border to become lawless.

I recall approaching a port of entry, and it was in Sasabe, Arizona. As I approached the port of entry and introduced myself to the agents that were there, and leaving aside much of that narrative, I was informed that, yes, there's a legal crossing at Sasabe at that port of entry in a fairly remote location in Arizona. But on other side of the legal port of entry are the illegal crossing areas that are controlled by the drug-smuggling gangs, the cartels. And that means that there's lawlessness on both sides of the border. If there's an entity that controls an illegal border crossing then that means that our side of that border is not under control. Immediately, if they decide who crosses and who doesn't, they're also deciding to allow illegals to come into the United States and illegal contraband to come into the United States.

And I was in fact there on location when there was an illegal drug smuggler that was picked up. He had a white pickup with a false bed in the box. Nice piece of body work. You had to have a practiced eye to see it. But a false floor underneath there that was 7, perhaps 8

inches, and underneath that false floor it was packed full of marijuana. Some would call it bales. They were wrapped up in packages about the size of a cement package, although it's not as heavy, some placed over 200 pounds, some placed 250 pounds of marijuana, underneath the false bed in that pickup. And we took the jaws of life and cut it open and I personally unloaded over 200 pounds of marijuana out from underneath the false bed in that pickup.

Now, the circumstances at that time—and I suspect this individual was prosecuted, partly because I was there—but he appeared to be an MS-13 gang member. He had a 13 tattooed on his arm right here. Full of tattoos. Had all of the look that you would have of an MS-13 drug-smuggling gang member. And the practice down there has been—unwritten, but in practice—that if someone is caught with less than 250 pounds of marijuana, that they're not prosecuted by the Federal Government. And when the loads got higher and more frequent, then the number went up to 500 pounds as the threshold for prosecution.

Now, where I come from, if you have any illegal drugs in your possession, generally you're going to be prosecuted. There are law enforcement officers that may not, but it's not a practice. We think that the law is the law. Well, if the law is not enforced on the southern border for those that come across the border illegally with illegal drugs in their possession to the tune of hundreds of pounds and in fact thousands of pounds, then what do we have left of the law enforcement fabric on our southern border whatsoever? And how can this be a practice, let alone a policy?

I saw it with my own eyes on that day and handled with my own hands. And as I talked to Border Patrol officers and the other law enforcement officers along the border, they confirmed that in some sectors that's the practice. They set the threshold because they didn't have enough prosecutors, they didn't have enough judges, and they didn't have enough prison beds to prosecute all the drug smugglers that they're picking up across the border, let alone 11,000 a night on average, a lot of them some might say just illegal aliens, just people coming into the United States committing the crime of unlawful entry into the United States.

But among them are drug smugglers. And among the drug smugglers are violent criminals of other stripes. Part of that goes with the package. But to think that they could come into the United States illegally with a load of 235 pounds of marijuana and weigh it up and put it underneath the bed of the pickup and think, Well, fine, I'm not going to go to prison for this. If they catch me, they will just impound the pickup, which likely is stolen anyway, and impound the marijuana, which I saw warehouses full. And I say "warehouses." More than the size of garages,

not the size of something you would see down at Boeing, to put it correct. So, vast amounts. More than a semi load of marijuana that had been confiscated altogether in one particular warehousing location. There are others.

But to think that we're not prosecuting with the full vigor of the law with someone who's coming through with a load of marijuana that is 200, 300, 499 pounds of marijuana. That's the America that we have on the southern border. And the people that don't live there and go like I do down to visit and get informed just accept the idea that their America is the same America in, let's say, South Dakota or northern Iowa as it happens to be on the southern border. And it's not true. It is a war zone there.

We have seen the numbers of the casualties and the drug wars in Mexico mount. And I remember sitting in Mexico City with some of the members of the cabinet and some of the members of the Mexican Congress who would tell me kind of off on the side that they had 2,000 federal officers, agents, troops that were killed in the drug wars trying to bring order and trying to bring the drug cartels underneath the enforcement of law, to break them up. This would be 3 to 4 years ago. They would say, we have lost 2,000 Federal officers. Now what numbers do we hear? Twenty-eight thousand. Twenty-eight thousand, mostly civilian, but not all civilian casualties, in the drug wars in Mexico. Twenty-eight thousand. Can you imagine the carnage? That's the size of one of the larger cities in my State, the number of like 28,000.

So here we are with Border Patrol officers, sending the National Guard down there. Thankfully, there are some Guard troops that are showing up. It does help. Every pair of boots on the ground helps and every bit of equipment we can put down there helps, and every bit of barrier that we build on the border helps. And I do want to build a fence, a wall and a fence. And I don't suggest that we build 2,000 miles right away next week, finish it by the end of next year. We could do that. We're a great Nation. We could do that without breaking a sweat if we had the will.

But I do suggest that we build a fence, a wall and a fence where they are crossing it, where they have a path beat down, and just keep extending the fence, the wall and the fence, until such time as they stop going around the end. If it takes 2,000 miles of fence, wall and fence, then so be it. If we can do it with a hundred miles or 200 miles, so be that.

But let's have enforcement of our border. Let's take our Nation back. Let's take our national parks and our national monuments back like Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument. Put that back in the hands of the American people.

The America that I envision is the America that I grew up in that said

you can walk anywhere in America, pick up a newspaper and read it in English, and you don't have to carry a gun. You can't do that everywhere in America today. The law enforcement is not such—the rule of law is not so established that you can go anywhere in America in that way and safely think that you can travel. You can't go to Organ Pipe Cactus down along the border, you can't take the jet ski on the lake in Texas. The Mexicans are controlling too much of that. And the retribution/restitution is almost nonexistent.

And so I would add also that there's another factor that I didn't hear the gentleman from Indiana mention and that's the factor called the spotters' locations on top of the mountains, primarily in Arizona. And as I traveled down there, I began to learn about these spotters' location from some of our law enforcement officers. And that would include the Shadow Wolves down at the Tihono O'odham Reservation. Shadow Wolves are one of the unique aspects of our border enforcement. They are the Native Americans that serve together and train down there and enforce the law on the reservation and on that area that spans the border. Actually, Tihono O'odham is on both sides, in Mexico to some degree. Most of it is in the United States.

And as I reviewed the border with them, they began to tell me, There's a spotter up on that mountain. He's watching us now. And I would look up there and of course I couldn't see him. I didn't know where to look, and he was too far away and I didn't have the glasses. And then we'd travel on down another few miles and they'd say, There's a spotter on that mountaintop and he's watching us. And as I began to put this together and traveled along the border and went to the Cabeza Prieta and some of the other locations along the border and talked to our officers, they began to tell me, Well, yes, we know where a lot of these locations are. I had a map there. Well, why don't you just put an X where you know where they are. So he'd put an X here, X there. I had him fill that in.

□ 1510

Along the way, we came up with a map that showed the location of at least 100 mountaintops that are controlled by Mexican drug smugglers who sit up on top of the mountain. They will take the stones that are up there and stack them up like sandbags around a gun emplacement. Well, it is a gun emplacement. It's a high-quality optics observatory location where they spot the travel of our law enforcement officers, primarily Border Patrol, all along the highways. If you go down in any area from Phoenix, going south towards the Mexican border, especially where you see an intersection where there is a highway going north and south and another one east and west, look up on one of those corners, and you will see a small mountain there in

a perfect location to be able to watch the traffic coming from all four directions. You can presume that that mountaintop is manned—it's a lookout mountaintop. It's a spotter mountaintop, and they're using that so they can tell the people who are moving their illegal loads across from Mexico into the United States when our law enforcement is coming up, when they're approaching. It will cause them to divert, to go the other way, to perhaps take a side road—and there aren't many, but it will give them that sense of warning.

Now, for those who might think that I'm catching this secondhand, Mr. Speaker, and for those who might think that this is anecdotal, I can tell you that it's not anecdotal. It's real. I went down and I climbed to the tops of a number of these mountains. I sat in those locations and I observed the traffic. In those locations, with the stones stacked like sandbags on top of one of the smaller mountains, I found a broken piece of some fairly high-quality binoculars, and you could see clothes that had been left there. You can see from those locations that they've been spotting and tipping off as to the law enforcement that's moving along. It's an essential component for them. If they're going to smuggle drugs and if they don't know where law enforcement is, they can't just drive blindly up into Arizona with a truckload of marijuana. They have to know when the coast is clear. Well, these are the "coast is clear" spotter locations. They're on top of the mountains in Arizona. I climbed to several of them, observed it from there, took pictures up there, and saw the pieces of litter that were laying around. You can see the patterns and the habits, and you can get a pretty good idea of what their diet is and what they're doing up there.

Then we got in a Blackhawk and flew to the top of other locations—spotter lookout mountains—and we settled down close to that. We brought in law enforcement officers from the ground. With the headphones on and listening to the scanner, you can hear the scrambler of the frequency that they're using when they communicate with each other. It's high-quality optics and high-quality communications equipment with scramblers and descramblers. You could hear, flying from mountaintop to mountaintop, the intensity of the chatter go up and up and up in the earphones when we were tuned in to the frequency that they were using. It's that chipmunk language that has been scrambled into something that's completely unintelligible even though it was coming in, and, you know, it was Spanish that was scrambled, and it got descrambled at the other end.

What I could hear was the intensity of that chatter going up and up and up. About a minute from the time we arrived at the next lookout mountaintop, the spotter mountaintop, that frequency and that transmission would immediately stop and be hushed. We

would get to the mountaintop in about a minute, and the location that had been manned just moments before, just minutes before, was empty. It was empty every time because they came down off the mountain and went out into the desert and hid. So, when they get out into the desert and get away from that location and hide, they don't have to get very far away, a half a mile or so, and you can't identify them as being the people who were sitting on top of the mountain. Plus, we don't have a law against sitting on top of a mountain in Arizona, so it's hard to prosecute. It's hard to bring them to justice, but they exist.

These are paramilitary locations. These are strategic locations. These are people who are armed with high-quality optics and with their high-quality communications devices, and they're set up to smuggle drugs into the United States. So far, we have not been very successful in snapping those spotters off of those mountaintops and taking that tool away from the drug smugglers. That's another piece that, I think, Mr. BURTON is well aware of, and I add to the dialogue that he delivered here.

What do we see instead?

Instead of the administration using the resources that are at its disposal to go down and enforce the law in places like Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and California, it's using resources to sue the State of Arizona. I've read through that complaint, and it's a bit astonishing to me to think that the Department of Justice could contrive such an argument, and even though it didn't mirror the ACLU's lawsuit and MALDEF's lawsuit and—let me see—the American Muslim Society's lawsuit, I thought it would. Instead, they wrote up a whole new legal theory. This is the Holder Justice Department.

Eric Holder essentially admitted that the President had ordered him to sue Arizona over their immigration law, and 5 minutes later, under oath, he admitted that he had not read the bill. So here we have the Attorney General bringing a lawsuit against the State of Arizona—determined to give the lawsuit—who came before the Judiciary Committee. Under oath, he testified that he hadn't read the bill. He conceded under oath that the President had ordered him to sue Arizona.

It was clear from listening to the President that the President hadn't read Arizona's law, S.B. 1070. So it's clear, as was concluded under oath and not denied, obviously, by the Attorney General of the United States, that the President ordered Eric Holder to sue Arizona. The President hadn't read the bill. Eric Holder hadn't read the bill, and they were determined to go forward anyway, so we made the commitment. I think that was actually announced by the Secretary of State when she was in South America—perhaps in Ecuador, if I remember right, maybe in Colombia.

It's interesting to read the complaint and think, What did they have to sue

about? You know, it's like throwing a tantrum, and then somebody asks, What are you mad about? Well, let me see. I'll have to come up with something. I'm sure I'm mad about something. What could it be? Well, let me think. I guess I can't be mad about this whole list—that is obvious—but I'll make up a new reason to be mad. This is a new reason to sue, and here is what it is:

They argued in their complaint, the Department of Justice's complaint in their file against Arizona, that Congress had entrusted the various agencies in the executive branch of government with establishing and maintaining a "careful balance," a careful balance between the various immigration laws that this country has. A careful balance. Huh.

Well, Congress did no such thing. There is no record of Congress passing legislation and saying, Keep a careful balance, Mr. President, between the various immigration laws so that the Department of Justice thinks this is all right and so that the Department of Homeland Security thinks this is all right, as well as the State Department. Surely, don't enforce an immigration law that might cause the diplomatic arm of the State Department any heartburn with President Calderon.

That's their argument, that they may not enforce obvious immigration laws because it might upset our neighbors in one direction or another. This is an astonishing legal position to argue, that they have been entrusted with establishing a "careful balance," then maintaining that careful balance and, therefore, because Arizona is compelled to defend themselves, that somehow that careful balance has been upset by Arizona helping to enforce the laws that have been passed by the United States of America here in this Congress, on this floor, where we gave no direction—no direction—to the executive branch to have the discretion to enforce some laws and not others. There is no discussion. There is no history. There is no Congressional Record in here, let alone in the statutes, themselves, that declares a "careful balance" standard. That standard never existed. It was created by the imaginations of the lawyers in the Department of Justice, and now we've got to go all the way to the Supreme Court to fix a problem created and motivated by a political decision to sue Arizona, a decision which came directly out of the White House to order, exactly, Eric Holder to file that lawsuit.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what I think of what's going on here with the immigration situation, and it's just a bit of a sequel to the gentleman from Indiana's statements on immigration, Mr. BURTON. I want to make sure that I support that initiative that he took here tonight.

From my standpoint, we've got to stop the bleeding at the border. We've got to reestablish the rule of law. We've got to raise the expectation that

the law will be enforced in all of its aspects. We need to do a careful inventory of all of the resources that we're deploying, especially on the southern border, and make sure, when a Border Patrol officer puts his life on the line and pulls over a stray truck that has got more than a ton of marijuana in it, that that Border Patrol officer never has to get on the phone and plead with a county prosecutor to pick up the open-and-shut case and prosecute it. If not, we don't have the Federal prosecutors enough to prosecute and incarcerate someone who is smuggling a ton or so of marijuana into the United States of America.

□ 1520

We must take a look at the deployment of our resources. If our border patrol officers are an adequate number, that means we also have to have an adequate number of prosecutors, judges, and prison beds so that we can enforce the law so that there's an expectation that this Nation has as one of its essential pillars of American exceptionalism the rule of law, and we must stand for it. We cannot and I will not stand for its erosion any longer, Mr. Speaker.

But I came here tonight to talk about a number of other things as well, aside from the immigration issue. It was Mr. BURTON that got me wound up as I listened to him talk. So I want to go back, and without a very smooth segue, I would like to just take us back, Mr. Speaker, to the election results of a couple of weeks ago and the message that was sent by the American people and reflect a little bit about my experience here and what I've seen happen politically and that works out this way.

As I came here, I came here in the majority and we had the votes to pass legislation that was reasonable that the American people could accept, and we did so. As I engaged in the debate here and I watched as the level of intensity of that debate diminished from our side and the level of rebuttal increased from over on this side of the aisle, on the Democrat side of the aisle, I don't know that I realized that at the time—I could feel it here internally but I don't know that I realized it clearly enough at the time but there was a shift going on in the minds of the American people. I thought we were doing the right thing for the most part in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, but we weren't articulating this to the American people in a way that was as useful and accurate as it should have been.

The best example of that, and I say this example because of my great respect for the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States and put their lives on the line on a regular basis, that selfless and noble commitment. What I saw happening in the State of Iowa in 2003 was when we had Democrat Presidential candidates coming into Iowa on a regular basis, moving through the State stopping over and over again.

And as I listened to this dialogue and I remember the date, it was October 5, 2003, and I'm watching the news and listening to the debate of the Presidential candidates, and I opened up The Des Moines Register newspaper. Inside page 3, headline at the top of the page, Candidate Howard Dean Repeatedly calls President Bush a Liar. And I was appalled. I thought, how can anyone call the President of the United States a liar? How can this be in this article? What must the President have said?

So I read that article, October 5, 2003, and looking for the statement that would be identified that would make our Commander in Chief a liar, and I read the article and I missed it apparently and I went back and read it a second time for the language that would be in this article that would confirm the truth of the headline that our President, our Commander in Chief, was a liar.

It wasn't there, Mr. Speaker. There wasn't an allegation in the article about what the President had said. It was just a story about Howard Dean calling George Bush a liar, repeatedly calling George Bush a liar. Well, it turned out it was about 16 words in the State of the Union address that had taken place just a few months, 6 months or so before that when the President of the United States said, We recently learned from the British that the Iraqis were seeking uranium in the continent of Africa. That's the 16 words, roughly speaking, in general delivery here that was the objection that was delivered by Howard Dean.

Well, it turns out the statement was unequivocally true, and I actually have the evidence of that in the brief case that I carry with me wherever I go. But it wasn't so much the point of that because I remember when Charlton Heston ran commercials during the Presidential elections of 1996, when he looked into the camera and he said, Mr. President—and he was speaking of President Clinton—Mr. President, when what you say is wrong and you don't know that it's wrong, that's called a mistake. But when what you say is wrong and you know that it is wrong, that's a lie.

Well, I think that's an accurate definition of the difference between a lie and a mistake. I don't think President Bush made a mistake. What he said in that State of the Union address was spot on accurate, absolutely provable. They disagreed with it because of one Ambassador Joe Wilson, who—I will give him a pass tonight, Mr. Speaker, because the clock is ticking.

However, I turned to my wife, appalled that a Presidential candidate could declare our Commander in Chief to be a liar, and I said, Marilyn, I'm going to Iraq. So a few days later by the 17th of October, 15th to the 17th, I was in Iraq, and I took a look at what was going on there. I traveled through there, did a lot of stops, met with a lot of our officers that were there and enlisted men and women and came back

with a different story on what was going on in that country.

But the assault on President Bush and the undermining of his position and our men and women under arms, when I heard people on this side of the aisle say, well, I support the troops but not their mission, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be allowed to stand, to concede a point such as that. My point is, if you support the troops, you support their mission. You cannot ask them to put their lives on the line for Americans if you don't believe in their mission, too. We can't ask them to go on that kind of a mission.

So what we saw happen was the assault, the verbal assault on the operations in a time of war in Iraq, being constantly pounded by the Presidential candidates and by many of the people over on this other side of the aisle in an effort to erode public opinion for the war in Iraq because doing so, in my estimation—and I understand that their motives may well have been pure—in my estimation in their desire to win the Presidency and their desire to win back the majority, their zeal to re-characterize our war in Iraq undermined public support for a mission that's turned out to be, on the balance of it, a pretty good ending considering what we were in the middle of during that period of time.

My point is the President of the United States and the executive branch of government did not bring out a full-throated defense nor did they articulate a reason for being in Iraq in an adequate way. That left the door open so that the criticism that came against the war in Iraq nearly cost what's now considered by many to be a victory in Iraq. Public opinion's got to hold together. It should hold together on facts, and Republicans need to stand together and stand up for truth in principle when we're right. We cannot allow a debate to go the other way just because we think we have the votes. We must stand and win the debate and hold the votes together. That, Mr. Speaker, is an essential principle.

As we go forward and we see these election results, we also need to understand that there will be a time coming into the 112th Congress, gavelled in, sworn in January 5 of 2011, that we'll sit here and we'll think we have the votes, so we just have to wait Democrats out while they have their say.

I want Democrats to have their say. I agree with the incoming Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, that we need to have sunlight on this place and run this place with the kind of function that allows for—he says open rules. I'd shorten it up a little bit and say a lot more open rules. I don't know that we can do all open rules but more open rules so there's a legitimate debate here. And if Democrats have an idea, bring that amendment, let's debate that amendment, we'll vote them up or down. If Republicans have an idea, also bring your amendment. We'll debate it up or down.

Think of how this process is supposed to work. You get busy and you go to work in the subcommittee and you hold hearings and you gather facts and the staff does the research work, crunches it in a way so that the under oath testimony and the information that's submitted is meaningful and that it can be cataloged and rationalized in a way that we can move forward with a good piece of policy. Once that hearing's need is satisfied, then you can go to a subcommittee and mark the bill up, and there of course you have to accept amendments from each side. Whatever the product is of the subcommittee needs to go to the full committee, and when it goes to the full committee, there needs to be a full committee markup. And there we need to allow for an open and legitimate debate because the process is taking an idea, present it to the hearing. If it can sustain itself in open, public dialogue, then it can actually become the bill that moves through the process, subjected to amendments that are designed to perfect the legislation, on through the full committee and to the floor for the same kind of process.

□ 1530

That's what's envisioned by our Founding Fathers. It was never envisioned that there would be a Speaker of the House that would run this Congress, the House of Representatives, out of her office with her staff and disallow amendments, disallow debate, disallow an opportunity to even vote with a level of clarity so the American people can see what's going on.

So their level of disgust rose up, and 58 Democrats were voted out of office, and there were a number of open seats that increased that number substantially from there.

So I think the message should have been clear. It doesn't seem to be clear. It is clear to me. The American people are filled up with a process that does not reach out to draw the wisdom from the American people through this republican form of government, which is guaranteed to us in the Constitution of the United States. They're filled up. They've had it with the nationalization, the takeover of the banks; AIG, the insurance company; Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and all the liabilities that go with that. They are fed up with the takeover of General Motors and Chrysler. Now it looks like, though, the White House is going to concede and sell some General Motors shares off into the marketplace. They will take a little loss, maybe even a big loss. I think that's a good step, and I encourage a lot more of it.

In fact, I'm hopeful that by the time the 112th Congress gavelled out roughly 2 years from now that the Federal Government will have divested itself of all of those private sector entities that have been taken over. And I am hopeful that the first act of the 113th Congress, a little more than 2 years from now, will be to finally pass the final version

of the repeal of ObamaCare so that that can then go to the desk of the next President of the United States for his signature to finally repeal ObamaCare.

As we sit here in this Congress and we're watching the importance of jobs, the American people said they've had it up to here with debt and deficit. It's about jobs and the economy, and it's about freedom and liberty and being able to order our own lives instead of being ordered within our lives by a nanny state.

And ObamaCare is the flagship of socialism that has been delivered to us over the objections of the American people by the tens of thousands who poured into this city multiple times to peacefully petition the government for redress of grievances. Tens of thousands of people, for the first time that I know of in history, put a ring around this Capitol Building. They held hands and said, Keep your hands off of my health care. It wasn't just one set of people with long arms holding hands, ringing the entire Capitol. They were six or eight deep all the way around the Capitol and clustered in the corners by the thousands who just didn't bother to get in the line. They said, Keep your hands off of our health care; and Speaker PELOSI marched through the middle of all of that with her oversized gavel to come do what she believed needed to be done for the American people who couldn't apparently think for themselves and said, We have to pass the bill to find out what's in it.

Well, ObamaCare that passed could not have passed here in the House even with the strong Democrat majority if it were not for legislative maneuvering in an unparalleled way, including a promise that there would be a reconciliation bill that would circumvent the filibuster in the Senate that would be passed over there and come over here to amend the ObamaCare bill that had yet to be passed.

So if you are going to do that, why can't you amend the bill and make it say what you want it to say, and send it back to the Senate? The reason for that is, Mr. Speaker, the Senate wouldn't pass the bill either because they elected SCOTT BROWN in Massachusetts. They were so appalled at socialized medicine coming to America that the people in the Bay State sent SCOTT BROWN to the Senate to put the brakes on ObamaCare. He put the message out pretty strong and pretty loud, and the people of Massachusetts clearly did.

But the Senate could not have passed the legislation that passed in the House on that day, or any day since. The House could not have passed it either if it weren't for the promise that reconciliation would come from the Senate. And even then, it couldn't pass the House unless there was a fig leaf that was brought up which was by the President to give the pro-life group of Democrats—the Stupak Dozen, it's called—their fig leaf protection, as if

an executive order could amend a statute of the United States of America.

So, Mr. Speaker, here is the situation: we have the 2001 and the 2003 tax brackets that need to be extended or we will be seeing a huge tax increase, perhaps the largest tax increase of our lifetimes poised to hit us at midnight December 31 if this lame-duck Congress doesn't act. The negotiations on that are taking place. I do believe that there is more leverage in the Senate on this issue than in the House. If we don't get that resolved, Mr. Speaker, then our job is going to be—the first job, H.R. 1, bill number one—to make those tax brackets permanent so that no one faces anything but a temporary tax increase. And I mean that I would love to see this done in the lame-duck. If it's not done, it must be the first order of business in the new Congress in January. The estate tax, it is a painful thing to think about that kicking in in a diabolical way.

The second thing, let's just presume we get it negotiated, and this Congress in lame duck resolves the issue of the '01 and '03 tax brackets, so we are not faced with a tax increase.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if that's resolved, my sense of this is—and I think I have a vast amount of support, including 173 signatures on a discharge petition—that we must then use as the first order of business the repeal of ObamaCare. H.R. 1, repeal of ObamaCare. The new Congress will pass that in a heartbeat, to pull ObamaCare out by the roots, lock, stock, and barrel, so there is not one vestige of it left behind.

And then we start down the path of shutting off the funding that would be used to implement or enforce ObamaCare. We owe it to the American people. We owe it to the constitutional conservatives that rose up all across this land and rallied together to fight ObamaCare. That's the biggest reason why you have this vast change. The biggest change in majorities here in 72 years has taken place because ObamaCare was the crown jewel of the agenda that was driven that the American people have rejected. So I'm encouraging that we move forward with that.

I have no appetite for tying together repeal and replace. Those are two separate subjects. We didn't have ObamaCare as a law of the land until late March of this year. We got along fine without it. Having it is worse than having nothing, but we need to win the debate on repeal of ObamaCare, win that debate, and then move down the line with the pieces that we would pass that would improve the health care for the American people that hold together, that hold together the doctor-patient relationship and the free market component and let people have their choices. That's the only way America works.

We are not a dependent Nation. We are not a Nation that can submit to a nanny state or an onerous Federal reg-

ulation. We are a proud, free, independent people, totally unsuitable for the European style of socialized democracy. We have freedom. We have vigor. We have rights that come from good God. We are a unique race of people. And the vigor of America's history attests to that, and the destiny of America's future attests to that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend very much. Stirring words, and accurate at that.

This being a time when we are recessing today through the Thanksgiving holiday, it is that time. We have so much to be thankful for. One of them is that we have a newspaper article—of course we've heard in the last week or so that it looks like the Obama administration was going to put off yet again the trials of the five charged in the 9/11 attacks as planning them. But the article from The New York Times says that the five Guantanamo detainees charged with coordinating the September 11 attacks told a military judge Monday they wanted to confess in full. And that was a move that seemed to challenge the government to put them to death.

At the start of what had been listed as routine proceedings Monday, Judge Henley said he had received a written statement from the five men, dated November 4, saying they plan to stop filing legal motions and to announce our confessions, to plea in full. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed said, "We don't want to waste our time with motions." You had one of the detainees, Ramzi bin al-Shibh, tell the judge, "We the brothers, all of us, would like to submit our confession." Mr. bin al-Shibh is charged with being the primary contact between the operation's organizers and the September 11 hijackers.

□ 1540

In one outburst, Mr. Bin al Scheib said he wanted to congratulate Osama bin Laden, adding, "We ask him to attack the American enemy with all his power." So that's the good news. They're going to plead guilty. We can be delighted with that.

The tragic thing was that was their announcement, according to the New York Times, back in December of 2008. December of 2008. But no, this administration wanted to play games with this country's safety and with justice. And so now, 2 years later, they're going to put it off for another couple of years, wait till after the next election so that he doesn't have to deal with it. These guys were ready for justice. They were ready to plead guilty until this administration played games. And even in the pleading that was declassified, written apparently by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed on behalf of all five, they have quotes in here like: We fight you with Almighty God. So if our act of jihad and our fighting with you cause fear and terror, then many thanks to

God, because it is Him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted in your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son, and your trinity beliefs.

Another statement he makes is: We will make all of our materials available to defend and deter and egress you and the filthy Jews from our countries. God has ordered us to spend for jihad and his cause. This is evident in many Koranic verses.

He also says: We fight you and destroy you and terrorize you. The jihad is God's cause and a great duty in our religion. So we ask from God to accept our contributions to the great attack, the great attack on America, and to place our 19 martyred brethren among the highest peaks in paradise.

So, you know, they filed that, but this administration wants to play games with these guys who were ready to plead guilty, filed no more motions until this administration offered them a big show trial. So, we have a lot to be thankful for in that regard. They're in prison, where they should be. And justice should have already come swiftly, but at least they're behind bars.

Well, I want to finish the time the gentleman has yielded to me.

William J. Federer does such a great job of putting together much of American histories and proclamations and prayers and really a great job of our godly heritage, just like David Barton does. This book, "Prayers & Presidents—Inspiring Faith from Leaders of the Past," among so many other things, has proclamations of Thanksgiving, and I thought it would be appropriate—though this will not be the last hour of today—today is the last hour before Thanksgiving, just so people know, Mr. Speaker, that this is our heritage.

This President says we're not a Christian Nation. I will not debate that with him. But the Presidents of the past, before this President, knew that it was. Perhaps it's not now.

George Washington, October 3, 1789, these are Washington's words:

"Where it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits and humbly implore His protection and favor, we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and ruler of nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions, to enable us all to render our national government a blessing to all the people, to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue."

James Madison, who's given so much credit for writing the Constitution. You would think the guy would know what was constitutional and what wasn't. March 4, 1815:

"No people ought to feel greater obligation to celebrate the goodness of the great disposer of events and of the destiny of nations than the people of the United States. To the same Divine Au-

thor of every good and perfect gift, we are indebted for all those privileges and advantages, religious as well as civil, which are so richly enjoyed in this favored land. I now recommend a day on which the people of every religious denomination may, in their solemn assemblies, unite their hearts and their voices in a freewill offering to their Heavenly Benefactor of their homage of thanksgiving and their songs of praise."

Now, we have these for virtually every year, every President, so I'm being very selective here because time is so short.

Abraham Lincoln, July 15, 1863:

"It is meet and right to recognize and confess the presence of the Almighty Father and the power of His hand equally in these triumphs and these sorrows.

"I invite the people of the United States to assemble on that occasion in their customary places of worship, in the forms approved by their consciences, render the homage due to the Divine Majesty for the wonderful things He has done in the Nation's behalf, and invoke the influence of His Holy Spirit to subdue the anger which has produced and long sustained a needless and cruel rebellion."

Andrew Johnson, 1865, October 28:

"Whereas, it has pleased Almighty God during the year which is now coming to an end, to relieve our beloved country from the fearful scourge of civil war and to permit us to secure the blessings of peace, unity, and harmony with great enlargement of civil liberty; and, whereas, our Heavenly Father has also, during the year, graciously averted from us the calamities of foreign war, pestilence, and famine, while our granaries are full of the fruits of an abundant season; and, whereas, righteousness exalteth a nation while sin is a reproach to any people, I recommend to the people thereof that they do set apart and observe the first Thursday of December next as a day of national thanksgiving to the Creator of the universe for these great deliverances and blessings."

Ulysses S. Grant, October 5, 1865:

"It becomes a people thus favored to making acknowledgement to the Supreme Author from whom such blessings flow of their gratitude and their dependence, to render praise and thanksgiving for the same, and devoutly to implore a continuance of God's mercy.

"I, Ulysses S. Grant, the President of the United States, do recommend that Thursday, the 18th day of November next, be observed as a day of thanksgiving and of praise and of prayer to Almighty God, the creator and the ruler of the universe. And I do further recommend to all the people of the United States to assemble on that day in their accustomed places of public worship and to unite in the homage and praise due to the bountiful Father of All Mercies and in fervent prayer for the continuance of the manifold bless-

ings He has vouchsafed to us as a people."

Rutherford B. Hayes, October of 1877:

"The completed circle of summer and winter, seed time and harvest has brought to us the accustomed season at which a religious people celebrate with praise and thanksgiving the enduring mercy of Almighty God. Let us, with one spirit and with one voice, lift up praise and thanksgiving to God for His manifold goodness to our land, His manifest care for our Nation. I earnestly recommend that, withdrawing themselves from secular cares and labors, the people of the United States do meet together on that day in their respective places of worship, there to give thanks and praise to Almighty God for His mercies to devoutly beseech their continuance."

And parenthetically here, in the midst of these Presidential proclamations, were it not for the teachings of Jesus and the fact that this Nation is based on biblical principle, you would not have a Nation in which people, whether Muslim or any religion, would be able to so freely worship. But it's because of that caring that we're able to do that here, because, as we know, in so many nations that are non-Christian, including Muslim nations, they don't have a lot of sympathy for those who practice Christianity.

Chester A. Arthur, November 4, 1881:

"It has long been the pious custom of our people, with the closing of the year, to look back upon the blessings brought to them in the changing course of the seasons and to return solemn thanks to the all-giving source from whom they flow. The countless benefits which have showered upon us during the past 12-month call for our fervent gratitude and make it fitting that we should rejoice with thankfulness that the Lord, in His infinite mercy, has most signally favored our country and our people."

There are just so many wonderful tributes before Thanksgiving.

Let me go to one from Benjamin Harrison, November of 1891—and these are just partial. Most of them are not the entire proclamation:

"It is a very glad incident of the marvelous prosperity which has crowned the year now drawing to a close that its helpful and reassuring touch has been felt by all our people.

□ 1550

"It has been as wide as our country and so special that every home has felt its comforting influence.

"It is too great to be the work of man's power and too particular to be the device of his mind. To God, the beneficent and the all-wise, who makes the labors of men to be fruitful, redeems their losses by His grace, and the measure of whose giving is as much beyond the thoughts of man as it is beyond his deserts, the praise and gratitude of the people of this favored Nation are justly due."

So many great proclamations.

Over to William McKinley, 1897:

"In remembrance of God's goodness to us during the past year, which has been so abundant," and then he quotes from Scripture, "let us offer unto him our thanksgiving and pay our vows unto the most high. Under His watchful providence, industry has prospered, the conditions of labor have been improved, the rewards of the husbandman have been increased and the comforts of our home multiplied. His mighty hand has preserved peace and protected the Nation. Respect for law and order has been strengthened, love of free institutions cherished, and all sections of our beloved country brought into closer bonds of fraternal regard and generous cooperation"

"For these great benefits, it is our duty to praise the Lord in a spirit of humility and gratitude and to offer up to Him our most earnest supplications that we may acknowledge our obligation as a people to Him who has so graciously granted us the blessings of free government and material prosperity."

Theodore Roosevelt, October of 1903:

"The season is at hand when, according to the custom of our people, it falls upon the President to appoint a day of praise and thanksgiving to God. During the last year, the Lord has dealt bountifully with us, giving us peace at home and abroad, and the chance for our citizens to work for their welfare unhindered by war, famine, and plague. Therefore, in thanking God for the mercies extended to us in the past, we beseech Him that he may not withhold them in the future."

William Howard Taft, the only President to have also been elected to Congress and to have been on the Supreme Court, actually as Chief Justice:

"A God-fearing Nation like ours owes it to its inborn and sincere sense of the moral duty to testify its devout gratitude to the All-Giver for the countless benefits it has enjoyed. For many years, it has been customary at the close of the year for the national executive to call upon his fellow countrymen to offer praise and thanks to God for the manifold blessings vouchsafed to them."

Woodrow Wilson says, in part, 1913:

"The season is at hand in which it has long been our respected custom as a people to turn in praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God for His manifold mercies and blessings to us as a Nation. The year that has just passed has been marked in a peculiar degree by manifestations of His gracious and beneficent providence."

John F. Kennedy, October of 1961:

"The Pilgrims, after a year of hardship and peril, humbly and reverently set aside a special day upon which to give thanks to God. I ask the head of each family to recount to his children the story of the first New England Thanksgiving, thus to impress upon future generations the heritage of this Nation born in toil, in danger, in purpose, and in the conviction that right and justice and freedom can, through

man's efforts, persevere and come to fruition with the blessing of God."

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his presentation here and setting the tone right for Thanksgiving as we are departing this city and going back to spend time with our families again. We are a grateful Nation, and I know that we will have a lot to be thankful for in the King household, as does America have a lot to be thankful for.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention, being recognized, and all of our service here to the American people.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON, and I am proud to come before the House today to address you and the American people regarding our Nation and regarding the state of affairs facing our people. This is an hour I claim on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus is that group of Members of Congress who believe that, yes, it's true, we all must be included in the great American Dream. The Progressive Caucus is that group of Congresspeople who believe that peace and diplomacy and development are far, far away preferable to war and fighting and strife.

The Progressive Caucus, we are the ones who say, yes, we should have child nutrition; yes, we should have food stamps for people in need; yes, we should have real commitments to small business and small farmers, not big business and the farming agricultural industry.

The Progressive Caucus is that body of Members in this Congress who come together around peace, around economic justice, around the issue of civil rights. We are the ones who say Don't Ask, Don't Tell must be repealed. We are the ones who say, as a Congress, that the American people are one people and need to be included in this great American Dream; that the arms of America are broad enough for all of us. This is what the Progressive Caucus is. This is what we believe.

We are not the ones who say that some Americans are not okay based on who they love or what their religion is; and we are not the ones who say that economic prosperity should only be for the wealthiest among us; and we are not the ones who urge war. We are the ones who urge peace. We are the ones who urge economic justice. We are the ones who believe that the poor must be within our thoughts, particularly at this time of year.

We are the ones who argue that we must extend unemployment insurance benefits, which, sadly, went down on the floor of this House earlier today.

This is the Progressive Caucus, and this hour we claim on behalf of the Progressive Caucus to talk to Americans about the importance of having a progressive vision for America. Even in this time after the elections were so difficult for so many, the fact is that we remain vigilant. We remain on the job projecting a progressive vision for this great Nation.

And this hour we speak on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, and this is the progressive message, three progressive messages today for everybody, three messages we want to hit.

The first message is the unemployment extension. I want to talk about that. The other one is the Bush tax cuts extension. And the third point is the absolute deluge of dirty money which totally swept through this last election cycle, corrupted our politics, all to the tune of about \$75 million, some of it from sources no one knows where they came from, and the absolute urgent need for transparency and to get corporate money out of American politics. Those are my three topics tonight.

Let me start by talking about unemployment benefits. Today, we had a vote to extend unemployment benefits which will expire at the end of this month, in November. This comes at a time when Americans are looking forward to what their Thanksgiving dinner is going to be like. This comes at a time when many Americans are looking at Christmas, Hanukkah, holidays, time to be together. But 2 million Americans, if we don't find a way to somehow get unemployment insurance benefits extended, which again failed on the House floor today because of Republican opposition, will have a very grim holiday.

□ 1600

This is a national shame. This is a travesty. This is something that is too, too bad.

Today on the House floor, unemployment extension benefits were up on the House floor, and we had to pass them by two-thirds vote because they were on the suspension calendar. It's necessary to put things on the suspension calendar because if we go through regular order, we can bet that there will be a Republican motion to recommit which will cause all kinds of damage and mischief. So the unemployment insurance extension was put up that is expiring in a few days. And you would think that something like extending unemployment benefits would be very easy because we have 9.6 percent unemployment, so many people are facing no opportunity to have any income if these benefits are allowed to expire at the end of this month, of course compassionate Congress would step right up. You wonder why we wouldn't get 100 percent of all these Members to vote for extension of unemployment benefits. But 150 of our colleagues on the Republican side voted "no" to extension of unemployment insurance

benefits, and because of that, we didn't pass it.

So now many of us who stay up at night worrying about what Americans are going to do, put food on the table for their families, have some more nights to worry, because the truth is we are not able to pass the extension of unemployment on the House floor. An overwhelming number of Democrats voted for it, and even some Republicans voted for it, to their credit. But we didn't get enough of that caucus, and so we ended up seeing that bill fail.

Obviously, the unemployment extension is hitting snags in the Senate. But if we could have passed it here, it would send a very important signal to the Senate that they must take up this measure, they must pass it through for the sake of the people, of the Americans, 2 million of them, who are seeing unemployment benefits expire even by the end of this year.

I want those Americans to know, nearly 2 million Americans to know that there are people in this House of Representatives who care desperately about them and their children. We put the measure on the floor and voted for it, needed two-thirds vote, couldn't get the support of our colleagues, and it didn't go. And sadly, I want to say that I hope those 150 Members who voted "no" think about you in the weeks to come. It is difficult, it is desperate, and I think that Americans, Mr. Speaker, need to raise their voices and look at the vote count to see who voted with them and who didn't.

Nearly 2 million Americans will lose unemployment benefits by the end of the holidays if Congress doesn't find a way to act. At this point, we may well have to act even if under a good, best case scenario after the extension of the benefits, after the benefits lapse. We have done it before. We may need to do it again. But the fact is that that is the situation.

According to the Department of Labor, 1.98 million workers, that is nearly 2 million workers, nationwide will lose benefits by the first of this year, January 1. By the end of February 2011, in only a few months, over 4.4 million workers will lose benefits.

Now it has devastating effects for individual families, no doubt about it, mom, dad, perhaps both, perhaps single-parent families not having any unemployment, in this tough economy not able to find a job. But it also has a devastating effect for our whole economy, because when people have unemployment insurance benefits to go buy groceries and pay rent, they can pay their landlord, they can pay the grocery store. And if you can pay the grocery store, then the grocery store has made a sale. And if the grocery store has made a sale of groceries, then they can keep those folks who work for the grocery store. And if the folks who work for the grocery store can keep their job, then they can buy some groceries. And if those folks can buy some groceries, then other people can. And

maybe they can pay their rent, and maybe that will mean that the landlords who perhaps rent to them will be able to maintain their building and be able to pay the utilities associated with running that apartment building that they might live in.

But if they can't, then the person doesn't get their unemployment benefits, they're not shopping as much, their shopping goes down, then the people who work there lose their jobs, then they can't pay their rent, now the landlord is not getting their rents in, now the landlord is looking at the building going into foreclosure because they can't even keep the mortgage up on that.

Now let's talk about housing. Let's talk about we have seen about 2.8 million foreclosures in 2009, about a similar number this year, on pace for that if not more. Those people who are counting on that unemployment check are counting on using that money to pay that mortgage. More foreclosures. This was incredibly irresponsible to not pass unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Americans saw what happened today and demand that Congress pass unemployment insurance benefits. Unemployment insurance benefits is good economics. It will cost our country more than it would have to spend to extend these benefits. It will cost our country more in terms of lost jobs, lost revenue to State, local, and Federal Government because of people who are not working anymore who now may become an expense. It will cost more money. It is incredibly shortsighted. It's bad economics. And when it comes to the individual effect on the family, it's just heartless. I have sympathy for people that heartless. I think you should be more compassionate than that, Mr. Speaker.

February 2011. We're halfway through November, we have December, then we have January. February 2011, 4.4 million workers will lose their unemployment benefits with devastating effect to their family and our entire economy.

Economists agree that ending emergency unemployment insurance benefits programs now hurts the economy. Even economists say it. This is not simply Keith Ellison on the House floor saying this. Economists who study this stuff every day say, do you know what? The effect of ending these programs is going to hurt our recovery and hurt our economy. The Department of Labor analysis by Wayne Vroman, who is an economist, well trained economist, found that unemployment insurance benefits boost economic activity by \$2 for every dollar spent in 2009. So if we do extend unemployment insurance benefits in the year 2009, that would mean that there would be \$2 in economic activity. Now that's a pretty good deal. That is what you call a multiplier effect, which is very beneficial.

Reducing unemployment insurance benefits will reduce our gross domestic

product. It will hurt our economy in the same way I just explained a moment ago. For people just tuning in, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say what will happen is that if people don't get the unemployment insurance benefits, they cannot spend, and the local retailers cannot maintain their staff, who then will end up laying people off. This will extend and increase unemployment. It's already 9.96 percent. How much more do the people who voted "no" want it to go?

Goldman Sachs has estimated that if the extension were allowed to expire, it would reduce economic growth by half a percentage point. Now, half a percentage point of economic growth, that just sounds like some statistic. But what that means is fewer refrigerators bought, fewer cars bought, fewer loaves of bread bought, fewer eggs bought, fewer people hired, fewer people who are going to be able to run the risk to start the small business that they've been thinking about. This means this is a bad thing for our economy. It means real pain to real people. That's what it means to see gross domestic product fall and economic growth slip by half a percentage point.

Another noted economic organization that does economic analysis has estimated that allowing the extensions to expire would reduce gross domestic product by about \$14.1 billion. Again, almost half a percentage point. This is a consensus of people who are economic experts.

Now, let me just tell you this. Some people who voted "no" are operating under a very false belief system. They think that unemployment insurance benefits are somehow living really high and you just got all kinds of money and basically you got so much money you don't even want to look for a job.

□ 1610

Basically, they're saying paying people unemployment insurance benefits, a little help from your fellow Americans when you're in a bind, somehow stifles the incentive to work. Somehow government subsidies—there's never an argument against those companies that get tax breaks to do offshore drilling. They're never something that's a disincentive for people who are well-heeled, high, mighty, and well-to-do. But whenever it comes to us who work really hard, anything the government gives us might make us want to work less. Absurd.

But the average weekly unemployment benefits—about \$303—are barely 70 percent of the poverty line for a family of four and, on average, replace less than 50 percent of a worker's prior earnings. I am going to repeat that because there's numbers in there and I don't want anybody to not get it. The average weekly unemployment insurance benefit—about \$300, a little more than that, about \$303—is barely 70 percent of the poverty line for a family of four. So if you've got mom, dad, and two kids, and you're getting unemployment insurance benefits, you're not

making the poverty line by about 30 percent. That's about 70 percent of the poverty line for a family of four and, on average, replaces less than half of the worker's prior earnings.

So people on unemployment insurance are not getting over on anyone. These are people who pay in while they're working. This is a benefit they worked for. This is a benefit all of us come together, all of us put in a pot, and say, you know what, if any one of us loses our job, we're going to use this to help you maintain while you're in that situation. This is a good program. This is something that every industrialized, civilized country, unless you're just an impoverished nation, any decent country would do this. And yet here we are saying "no" to these people.

And here's another thing. Some folks will say, Well, you know, if we cut them off, maybe they'll work harder now. Maybe they'll look for a job. They're looking for a job. You can't get unemployment insurance benefits unless you're looking for a job. That's one of the rules of the program. But with every five job seekers for one opening, with five job seekers for every one opening, workers are unemployed because there's simply not enough jobs yet. Even though in the last several months we've been adding private sector jobs, about a millions jobs we've created since the recovery began, there's still not enough jobs.

You see, during the Bush era they just did that much damage to the economy. They lost about 800,000 jobs in the very month that Barack Obama took office as President of the United States. So we're just climbing out of this very deep hole that the Republican Congress and George Bush put us in. But even though jobs are increasing, there's still about five people looking for every one opening for a job. In other words, even if every job opening were filled by an unemployed worker, over 11 million workers would still be looking for a job, because even though we have been doing a good job, the damage is so severe that we've got a long way to go.

Now it's important to understand that even nonpartisan organizations who look at these questions have a lot to tell us about it. The independent Congressional Budget Office—they don't work for the Republicans, don't work for the Democrats. They just work for you, the American people, to try to give us the best information they can. The independent Congressional Budget Office found that research suggests that the effect of recent extensions in unemployment insurance benefits on the duration of unemployment for recipients was rather small, meaning the people don't stay on unemployment long. They use it while they need it, and then they get another job. The duration for unemployment—people just need it to get by. Sometimes it goes longer than expected, particularly in an economy like

this where we have so much foreclosure crisis, so many hits to our economy.

But, you know what? People are looking for work. They're trying. They're doing everything they can. They're doing the best that they can. And this government of ours, which represents our people—of, by, and for the people—should be there to extend unemployment benefits on an emergency basis when we have a job crisis like the one we have right now. And it's a shame and a national disgrace that this Congress could not get two-thirds of the vote of this Congress to pass unemployment insurance benefits; 150 people voted "no." One hundred fifty Members of Congress voted "no." And because they refused to step up to the plate and do what was right for the American people, about 2 million of our fellow Americans by January 1 are going to be going without. They're going to have a very grim set of holidays. And my heart aches for them. But, by February, 4.4 million will be in extremely dire straits.

And so I just want people to know, Mr. Speaker, that the people don't have to take it. They can call, they can write, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we live in a democracy. It's a free and open society and people can let their voices be heard to their government that this kind of behavior in Congress is not okay. Mr. Speaker, they can do that. And if they did, I think it would be a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has never terminated federally funded jobless benefits when the unemployment rate was as high as it is today. Let me say that again: Congress has never terminated federally funded jobless benefits when the unemployment rate was as high as it is now, 9.6. Since the unemployment insurance system was founded 75 years ago, Mr. Speaker, Congress has never terminated an emergency unemployment program when the unemployment rate was even above 7.5 percent, let alone 9.6 percent. Because it's irresponsible to the individual family and because it's devastating to our economy at large.

Even following the 2001 Bush recession, the Republican-controlled Congress maintained temporary Federal unemployment insurance programs until the unemployment rate went down to 5.8. What is the difference between our Republicans of today and those of even just a few years ago? Maybe some people think, Mr. Speaker, I don't know, maybe they think their political chances are better the more pain poor people have to face.

If the current temporary program would be allowed to expire by the end of November, which it is set for, it would be shorter than temporary programs enacted in numerous years of recessions. This year, if we let this program expire, we would have cut the emergency program shorter than we did in 1990, in 2000, in the 1973 recessions. Why are we so stingy now, Mr. Speaker? I don't know. I don't know.

But I bet you if the American people exercise their First Amendment rights, some people would listen, because sometimes politicians can't see the light until they feel the heat.

Unemployment insurance benefits have dramatically decreased poverty, Mr. Speaker. And we're at a time when we have record poverty. But because of unemployment insurance benefits, we fought back that poverty and provided economic security to millions of middle-income American families. Unemployment insurance benefits kept an estimated 3.3 million Americans out of poverty in 2009. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because that's another one people really need to be focusing on: unemployment insurance benefits kept an estimated 3.3 million Americans out of poverty in 2009. This is a good thing. And now we're looking at ending the program by the end of this month. That's wrong. Without these benefits, the increase in poverty from 2008 to 2009 would have been nearly 6.9 million rather than 3.6 million. So poverty would have been twice what it was without our acting in the earlier times that we did. Because we acted already, we were able to cut poverty to half the rate that it would have been. But now we're letting it expire.

Now I also want to say almost a million children were kept out of poverty in 2009 because of unemployment insurance benefits. Almost a million children. We're talking about little ones that are trying to go to school, trying to learn, developing brains. And because they were able to get the basic decency from their government in unemployment insurance benefits, they were able to stay out of poverty. But a million children, a million little ones going into winter, going into the cold months, going into the holidays are going to have to face that poverty because our Congress would not act.

□ 1620

I just want to say that that's wrong. The American children deserve better from their government than they got today on this House floor.

I want to move on to tax cuts, Mr. Speaker, but before I do, I want to repeat some of the more salient points because maybe some folks just got on C-SPAN. I just want to say 2 million Americans stand to lose benefits during the holiday season because Congress failed to extend unemployment insurance benefits—2 million. Mr. Speaker, 2 million Americans stand to lose unemployment insurance benefits this holiday season, and 2 million more could lose them by February 2011. These Americans buy goods and services, stimulating our economy, which keeps people employed, which keeps rents being paid, which keeps mortgages being paid, and which keeps our economy moving toward recovery. Because we're not acting the way we should, we are putting this recovery in

jeopardy. Is electoral success so important that you're willing to put 2 million more people into poverty? It's a shame.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to juxtapose this question of our refusal to pass unemployment insurance benefits with what seems to be the thing that everybody feels like talking about around Washington, which is whether or not we are going to extend tax cuts, tax breaks, for the richest Americans. Right now, the debate is:

Shall we extend the Bush tax cuts up to \$250,000, which means that people who make more than that will be able to have their tax breaks extended for the amount below that, or will we just extend them for all, up to the top 2 percent, which would mean extending them for everyone?

If we extended them for everyone, that would cost us an extra \$700 billion. The people who are most adamant and who scream the loudest about deficits, debt, and spending are the first ones who want to make sure that the richest Americans get their tax cuts to the tune of \$700 billion. Mr. Speaker, we don't have the \$700 billion, so where are we going to get the \$700 billion? We're going to borrow it. Our Republican colleagues want us to borrow \$700 billion and give it to the richest Americans. So we wonder, Who are we going to borrow it from? Probably from the Chinese. I don't know. We don't have it.

Also, according to their pledge to America, they want us to cut education by about 20 percent. Is this a recipe for a competitive America? Those people will say, Oh, we want America to be competitive. They say that they want America to compete, so we're going to add to the debt to the tune of \$700 billion. We're going to borrow the money, and we're going to cut education. The richest Americans can—I don't know—buy more boats, stay in more luxury hotels, buy big, fat cigars, and buy bottles of Cristal. I don't know what they do. I'm not one of them. The point of the matter is it's wrong, and we ought to be embarrassed to talk about it.

Now, some of our friends say, Oh, yeah, we've got to give the top 2 percent a tax break, too—they'll say—because it's going to help boost jobs.

Wait a minute. Didn't we have these tax cuts back in 2001 and 2003? Don't we have massive unemployment? Their program has failed. The evidence is on the wall. It's there. Their program has failed. If tax cuts are so great, why did we lose 800,000 jobs in the last month that George Bush was the President of the United States? No. Forgive me. 841,000 jobs. Can't leave out those 41,000 jobs, because there were 41,000 people in those jobs. Why did we lose about 4 million jobs during the last 6 months of the Bush Presidency if cutting taxes were such a great idea and a panacea for everything?

I'm going to say, Mr. Speaker, that cutting taxes is not a bad thing at all. It depends on who you cut them for.

Cutting middle-income taxes might actually help people. Cutting taxes for the richest Americans is damaging to this economy and is unfair to the rest of us, and there are a lot of wealthy people who agree with me. Because you know what? They know that the economic ladder has got to stay in place. You can't live in this great country and make all the money that living here has given you the opportunity to make and then pull that ladder up behind you once you've made it all. It's wrong to do.

You know, we Democrats/Progressives don't have any problem with people coming up with a great idea and marketing it. People like it, so they buy it. They make a lot of money. Okay. That's fine. The question is, once you have used our roads to move your products around, once you have used our public schools to educate your workforce, once you have relied on our military to protect you, once you have used our police force to protect your firms and all your assets and property, once you have used our emergency medical services if, heaven forbid, you get a heart attack from all that work and you need that service, once you use all of these government services, once you drink the water which some government worker has inspected to make sure is safe, once you eat the meat which some government worker has inspected to make sure is safe and you benefit from all of that and then you say, "Oh, I don't want to pay any taxes. I don't want to pay any taxes. I want to keep it all just for me," there is a word for that—and it is "greed." There is no other word for it. I shudder when greed has been elevated to a political philosophy.

We're not talking about a complete government takeover, which some people are so happy to try to accuse us of. We're talking about a mixed economy where the public and the private sectors are in reasonable balance. That's all we're talking about. We cannot borrow \$700 billion, give it to the richest 2 percent of Americans and then cut our educational system and say that we are that balanced, reasonable, mixed public-private sector economy. We can't do it.

So I say that this middle-income tax cut—again, if you do make lots of money, if you are the top 2 percent, your tax cut will be extended from zero to \$250,000. That's the thing. Everybody is going to still have an extension, but you won't get it if you're above that. So that's what we mean by a middle class or a middle-income tax cut. It's very important to understand this. This is not something that's against the rich folks. Hey, look. You know, there are a lot of good rich people. The fact is many of them understand that the ladder of opportunity must be there for everybody else, but there are some who figure, I've got money. Skip you.

That's wrong. We need people who understand that this great country has

allowed them to make the money that they made and that the ladder of opportunity needs to stay where it is.

I was talking to one fellow who said, Oh, we should have a tax cut for everybody, not just for the 98 percent and down. We well-to-do people do so much for the economy.

I said, Well, wait a minute. Didn't the rest of us do so much for you? Didn't you brag to me about how you went to college on the GI Bill? Who did that for you? That was the public. That was the American people. Didn't you go to State University of "Whatever"? Didn't you tell me you were a member of the State patrol for a while before you went into your business?

This is a real conversation I had with somebody who benefited so much from the public but then didn't want to hand anything back.

Right now, I'm joined by one of my very favorite Members of Congress, the Congressman from the great State of California.

Congressman, what do you say tonight?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Mr. ELLISON, I was in my office. Of course this floor is constantly on the TV screen, so I looked up, and I said, Hey, there's my man. There's the guy who is from the great upper Midwest, who has seen the incredible downturn of the American economy. I know that you've worked hard for your district to try to bring in those jobs and to try to create the legislation that would bring the jobs into that district. As you were talking, I said, I'm going to go over and say just a couple of things in support of the message that you're giving today, a message that over the last 2 years has been one of a consistent effort by the Democratic House to stabilize the American economy. We did that with the Wall Street bank bailout, which a lot of people didn't like.

□ 1630

I had problems with it, too. I think those Wall Street barons should have paid a heavy price, but the price that they could not pay and should not pay is the total collapse of the financial industry of the world because we would wind up, mom and pop at home, whether you have a 401(k), which unfortunately became a 201(k), whatever, we did that and it worked.

Then you came right back, the Democrats in this House and the President came back with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, 3 million jobs out of that, stabilizing once again the situation where the jobs were in free-fall the last months actually of the Bush administration in 2008, 800,000 jobs lost. But that began to turn around, and so in 2009 we began to see a turnaround, a lessening of the lost jobs. They continued to lose jobs, but nonetheless, each month that went by there was fewer and fewer jobs lost, and then in 2010 we've actually seen the growth of jobs in America once again, not only as a result of those two

pieces of legislation, but dozens and dozens of other bills that I was fortunate enough to work on when I came here just over a year ago in a special election.

It's been hard work. We've not had much help, and this is one of the things that I find so disappointing having come here just a year ago, and on all of those bills, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus bill, the HIRE act that gave incentives to employers to go hire people, the saving of the American automobile industry. The Republicans voted against these bills.

On unemployment insurance, the Republicans voted against it. I mean it's easy enough I suppose if you have a job not to worry about the uninsured, but if you don't have a job, what are you going to do? How do you keep a roof over your family's head? How do you provide the food? Well, you do it by getting an unemployment insurance check, which, actually—workers in America and employers in America have paid into an insurance program year after year after year and that uninsurance program provides the insurance when a person loses their job.

I couldn't believe it today on the floor. We have more than 2 million Americans whose unemployment check is going to run out during these holidays. Between the end of Thanksgiving and New Year's, 2 million Americans will lose their unemployment check. Now, the economy not's running the way we want it to run, and hopefully you and I will have a chance to talk about making it in America, making this economy once again, but today, on this floor, not more than 3 hours ago, we were unable to muster a two-thirds vote to pass an uninsurance check extension so that people would have food, shelter, clothing, maybe even a small gift for their children at Christmas-time.

What are we doing here? If we are such—we, not we, the Democrats voted en masse for this, but 143 Republicans, more than the one-third to block, voted against this. We're talking about the ultimate Scrooge. This would make Charles Dickens right up there on top with Scrooge on Christmas, on the holiday season, when we ought to be generous. 143 Republicans this day voted to deny 2 million Americans enough money to buy a gift for their child, to put a holiday meal on the table.

Okay, fine, I understand where they're coming from—no, I don't understand where they're coming from. I don't get it but we need to move forward. We need to move forward. I know you have been talking about that. And we can do it. We can rebuild the American manufacturing industry. It's there for us to do it if we use wise public policy, and I know you have been talking about this, and I'd love to engage in a dialogue with you and see if we can share some thoughts here.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, you know, Congressman, I just want to thank you for

joining me down here for the progressive message. It's really always a joy to be with you. I was spending a little bit of time talking about how this denial of the unemployment insurance benefits extension absolutely has a devastating effect to the individual family. It also has a devastating effect to the economy because consumer demand is bolstered by people having some income, even when they're unemployed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is a local store. If you have no money, you are not going to do one thing for this economy except be an additional burden to it. And so if you have an unemployment check—and let's keep in mind, that's something that the workers and employers have paid into so that when you lose your job, you have a continuation of income and you use that money to go down and buy some clothing for your kid, stimulate the economy, give the retailer—you buy bread, you buy food, you're able to pay your rent, you're not going to have to face that foreclosure and help drive down the prices of homes in your neighborhood. It's all there. It makes so much sense on the economic level.

But on the human, moral level, about where we are as Americans, it's not the fault of that worker out there that lost his job that he doesn't have a job. Many, many reasons for it. Wall Street, greed on Wall Street, all of those things. We can talk about that later, but it's not that worker's fault. It's not his kid's fault. Can't we just muster enough compassion to give those families an opportunity during this holiday season and on into the new year enough money to stay in their home?

What are they are going to do, go out and live in their car? They can't afford to buy the gas, I guess they can become the homeless. 143 Republicans this day said go homeless, go live in your car, don't worry about the holiday gifts, don't worry about your children because they will have no food, they'll have no place to live. What are they thinking in this House? 143 Republicans said "no." They blocked, 7 days before Thanksgiving, they blocked an opportunity for 2 million American families to have enough money to put a holiday meal on their table, to put shelter over their family.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, thank you for pointing those things out. One of things that continues to stay on my mind is how some of the rationale for this "no" position that was taken by so many of our colleagues in the Republican caucus is that with, well, you know, if you give people unemployment insurance benefits, maybe that will dissuade them from looking for a job. Do you have any views on that particular mode of thinking?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, apparently those people that say that haven't been looking for a job.

Mr. ELLISON. It's easy to say when it's not you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's easy enough to say, but when you're out hunting for a job, you know these are difficult times. And we're going to make efforts to turn that around, and we've talked about that a little already, but the jobs are not there. We need to move this economy forward, and then as we do so, those jobs will come back. And let's understand, this is not a bunch of welfare. A lot of people are against welfare. We understand that, but these are middle class Americans—

Mr. ELLISON. That is right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Who had a good paying job 2 years ago, a year and a half ago, 6 months ago. These are men and women who over the years have been the backbone of this Nation, middle class America, and yet 143 of our colleagues on the Republican side didn't see it that way. I guess they thought, well, if they don't have any money they will go to work.

I would ask any one of those 143 to leave here today and go out and see if they could find a job, and if I were an employer and somebody had that amount of compassion, I know where I would send them. I'd send them out the door and good-bye.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, Congressman, you're not talking about one of those big lobbyist jobs. You mean a real job that makes you put your back into it, right, that so many Americans have to turn to, to be able to meet their daily needs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Go out, let's see if you can pay the building—let's see if you can go out and run a backhoe, dig a ditch, or operate a bus or train or whatever. No, no, no, and when they lose their job here, as they should for this vote alone—they should for this vote alone lose their job here—no, they will go down to K Street, and they will get one of those high-powered office building jobs and they'll come back and lobby us and try to tell us what we should do. I will tell them what they should do—they should take a hike right out of this building because they're the super Scrooges of this session.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, thank you for making those points.

I just want to see if I can also get your views because as we're talking about denying families basic money right before Thanksgiving, right before New Year's, right before Christmas, right before Hanukkah, right before so many American holidays, we are also really talking about whether we should extend tax cuts to the top 2 percent to the tune of about \$700 billion for us which we don't have and we'll have to borrow. I wonder if you have any thoughts on this.

□ 1640

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, this is another issue that's going to be before the Congress in the next couple of weeks, and that is, what are we going to do about the 2001, 2003 tax reductions that expire on December 31?

Those tax reductions were pushed forward by George W. Bush and the Republicans, who then controlled both this House and the Senate. And they wrote the tax law so that the middle-income got a little bit. It was worthwhile. It was a good reduction. But the real reduction went to those with the big bucks, those who had more than \$250,000, \$500,000, \$1 million, \$1 billion annual incomes. They got the big bucks.

And what happened was, we saw, once again, the widening of the gap between the working men and women of the middle class and the high and the mighty, the top 1 percent of this Nation who now control 70, 80 percent of all the wealth of the Nation. They certainly have the big salaries. And do they need a tax break at the expense of an unemployed worker from a factory in your district, an unemployed worker from a factory or from a school in my district? I don't think so.

Let's talk about what it is. For those making \$1 million a year, the tax cut is worth \$83,000 a year. Now, you tell me how many out there in middle America are making \$83,000 a year. Well, we know that there are 2 million that are unemployed that certainly aren't. But if you took that money, that \$83,000 for all those millionaires, you could create 3 million jobs that would pay \$30,000 a year. Not a great deal, but a living wage for 3 million Americans.

So we've got choices here. We've got choices. You are going to give the wealthy even more, \$83,000 a year—that's just for millionaires. And there are billionaires out there who will make even more out of this tax cut. What are they going to do with it? Well, I guess they could buy a Mercedes-Benz E-Class which does cost about \$82,000. Maybe we would like to think of them with a nice big, fat cigar. They could buy 2,000 of those cigars every year for the next decade, and they could light each one of those cigars with a \$100 bill. Now that's a worthy way to do it. Or would you rather have 3 million Americans earning \$30,000 a year or, in this case, even an unemployment insurance check?

And one of the things, Mr. ELLISON, some days I want to stand up here on the floor and just scream and say, What are you guys thinking? Deficit reduction. Oh, my goodness, we just finished an election. And deficit reduction was on every advertisement. We have got to deal with the deficit. We have got to deal with the deficit. Well, what the Republicans are proposing is a tax break for those who earn more than \$250,000 a year.

Let me back up here. Every American taxpayer, every American taxpayer will receive a tax reduction up to \$250,000. If they are making more than that, the tax break that they have had for the last decade would end.

Now, my Republican colleagues want to extend that tax cut for the wealthy. What it means is an additional \$700 billion of deficit over the next decade,

\$700 billion. So you can't talk out of both sides of your mouth here. Either you are a deficit hawk and you vote against a tax cut for the wealthy, or you are a hypocrite and you vote for a tax cut for the wealthy and increase the deficit by \$700 billion.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, Congressman, another thought I wanted to get your views on here, it's been puzzling me. These folks say it with such conviction that they must believe it. They say, Well, if we cut these taxes, this will lead to an economic boom. But that is trouble because, why did we end up in such an economic malaise, because we've had these tax cuts in place since 2001 and 2003; and this decade has been the decade of the slowest economic growth since World War II? So if tax cuts are the answer for everything, why didn't we have great economic growth, and why do we have such an economic recession now since we've had these tax cuts in place?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, because tax cuts, particularly at the upper income levels, don't equate to economic growth. You are quite correct, the George W. Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 helped create the extraordinary deficit that we currently have. There were a couple of other things, two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan, that were not paid for by American money but rather by borrowed Chinese money and the tax cuts and the ultimate near collapse of the economy in 2007 and 2008. Those all added to the huge deficit.

But it's also, just as you have pointed out, clear by the employment statistics that following the tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 that the number of people employed actually reduced by nearly 600,000 people over the period of the next 5 years. So, you know, it doesn't equate.

Now, we need to provide the current tax cuts for those in the middle class that are earning less than \$250,000. And, really, for every American earning \$250,000 or less—if they make more, they're going to pay a little more—it's very, very clear that if we continue to provide the tax cuts for the very wealthy, it's not going to create more jobs. For those who need the money, they're going to pay their mortgage, they're going to make that car payment, they're going to buy food, they're going to buy clothing, they're going to invest that tax money into the economy, stimulating the economy. For those that are wealthy, I guess they will go buy another Mercedes-Benz, which I think is manufactured overseas.

Mr. ELLISON. I think you're right. Congressman, let's now turn to our good friend from the great State of Tennessee. Congratulations on your reelection, my friend. Congressman, we've been talking about economic justice, the denial of the unemployment insurance extension, the Bush tax cuts. What are your thoughts tonight?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I thank you for having this hour and for letting me join you, each of you.

These are the issues that are important to the American people. And I tried to address some of them in 1 minute. You can't discuss them in 1 minute. One of the issues we heard about was the deficit. The deficit was created by the Congress that was begun in the beginning of this century. The Congress in 1994, when President Clinton was President, a Democratic Congress with all Democratic votes passed a balanced budget bill that balanced the budget by the year 2000, and that balanced budget with a surplus was squandered with Bush tax cuts that cost tremendous amounts of money and a trillion-dollar war in Iraq without weapons of mass destruction and without a well-defined purpose and without the truth behind the purpose, I believe, of that war. And then an additional war in Afghanistan that was made the secondary war. This has created the great deficit that we have now, and you've got to correct that through income or through cuts.

What has been recommended by the bipartisan panel the President set up bears looking at as a beginning. It's going to take some tough decisions, but we also need revenue; and the revenue can't be across-the-board extensions for the Bush tax cuts. And to the upper 2 percent, as Mr. GARAMENDI was talking, they don't spend that money. My friends all drive Chryslers, I must make amends; dear Lord get me a Mercedes-Benz. That's an old sixties song. That's what they buy, is a Mercedes-Benz or maybe something from Cartier, which doesn't really stimulate the economy. It might tickle the fancy of somebody, but it doesn't stimulate the economy.

We've got to make some difficult decisions and earmarks aren't the issue. Earmarks don't take away from the deficit. It just means that rather than your Congressperson from your district who knows your needs, it will be somebody in Washington spending that money. The earmarks need to be done in a transparent manner, and this Congress has seen that they are published. The people have to say that they are theirs, they have no financial interest, they don't have a personal stake, and they can't be for a for-profit company.

Earmarks in and of themselves are not bad. They just need to be cleaned up, and this Congress has cleaned them up. But the fact is, we need to make some difficult decisions. I'm prepared to make those difficult decisions on some long-term economic policies that will help clean up the deficit, which we need to do. I don't agree with much of what was put in the bipartisan proposal that was just recently announced by Mr. Bowles and Mr. SIMPSON, but it's a starting point; and it should not be summarily dismissed as it was by some from my party. On the other hand, the issue of earmarks is a subterfuge or just an issue to be thrown out there which has nothing to do with the deficit.

□ 1650

It's going to take some tough decisions, and the Department of Defense can't be off the table. Some say, Oh, you can't deal with the Department of Defense. There's a lot of money in the defense budgets that's there because of who manufactures the weapons and not the purpose of the weapons, and there's a lot of waste in the Department of Defense, and we need to look there as well. And we're going to have to make some large cuts, and that's where most of the money is.

So I join with you. I appreciate, Mr. ELLISON, your work. I appreciate Mr. Stein's quoting you in Time Magazine when you cited me as part of your team, and I'm going to be part of your team. And, Mr. GARAMENDI, I appreciate what you've done from California and in your leading these discussions. And I just want to be a part of the ending of this Congress that does some economic justice and that we try to see that economic justice is not forgotten in the 112th.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, I'm going to leave the last word to Congressman GARAMENDI, but I just want to say before we close out, because we are getting close to the end of the hour, this Democratic Caucus is resolute. In this last election, you know, okay, we got our nose bloodied a little bit. But you know what? We are focused on the best benefit and the welfare of the American people. We will not bend. We will not bow. We will stay here talking about Making It In America, talking about jobs, talking about renewable energy, talking about manufacturing, talking about infrastructure, fighting back these unjust economic policies which skew our economy so that we pull up the ladder of economic opportunity. We're not going to allow it.

I'm going to let Congressman GARAMENDI give the last word. And I want to thank you, Congressman COHEN. You are a joy to work with, a pleasure, and your wit, your charm, and your knowledge are always a benefit.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. ELLISON, thank you so very, very much. And I really want to congratulate you on the success of your reelection. And I know why you were reelected—because you have a heart. You've got a moral center that's focused clearly upon the needs of the men and women in your district who struggle every day to put food on their table, to take care of their children, make sure they have a good upbringing, the clothes, the education, and a roof over their head. I mean, that's really where we ought to be going. That should be our moral compass, and it certainly is yours, and I know it is yours also, Mr. COHEN. Because of that, you're back here.

But there's some real serious issues that divide us here in this Congress. We saw one today—the issue of the unemployment insurance. You know, 143 of our Republican colleagues blocked that payment that would give men and

women an opportunity to have enough money to take care of the holidays that are ahead of us, put food on the table, maybe buy a few gifts.

There is another thing that we need to do, and we've been working at that for more than 2 years, in almost every case without any help whatsoever from our Republican colleagues, and that is to get America back to work. The Recovery Act, 3 million jobs, no Republican votes. The HIRE Act, another few couple of hundred thousand jobs, no Republican votes.

Even when it came down to putting teachers in schools, to keep them there—in my own State, 16,600 teachers are in the classroom because we put some more money on the table to help the States and local communities—police and firemen the same, not one Republican vote.

Talk about the deficit forever. Yeah, you can talk about the deficit, but it comes down to a point, are you willing to take action to deal with the deficit, and our Republican colleagues have said a resounding “no” thus far. They want a \$700 billion increase in the deficit to finance a tax break for the wealthiest part of America's society. This is hypocritical. This is wrong.

And it's time for us to go. Mr. ELLISON, thank you so very much. Mr. COHEN, delighted to have the opportunity to talk to you about these fundamental American issues.

Mr. COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. I would just like to make one statement, Mr. ROHRABACHER, if you would permit before.

You know, I think it was Wavy Gravy that said, if you remember the sixties you weren't part of the sixties. Well, when you get into your sixties, sometimes you forget things. It was, I believe, Janis Joplin, and it was: My friends all have Porsches. I must make amends. Lord, won't you buy me a Mercedes-Benz.

MADE IN CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address my colleagues about the greatest threat over the horizon, “Made in China.”

Mr. Speaker, while focused on the deadly threat posed to our immediate safety by the forces of radical Islam, many Americans seem oblivious to the storm clouds just over the horizon.

I come to the floor with a grave warning to the American people. We face a threat to our national security with complexity and global scope such as we have never experienced in this Nation's history. This threat is pervasive. It challenges our economic, political, and financial structure, as well as the security of our homeland.

I have come to the floor to plead: We can no longer look at the dynamic shift

in power that is taking place and console ourselves with wishful thinking. We must quit fooling ourselves that there are offsetting elements at play, that the glass can be viewed as half full or half empty. It is clear that a powerful adversary is unabashedly out to grab that glass and drain it, consume it at the expense of the American people, and leave Americans of the future in thirst of the prosperity and security which we now take for granted.

And it is not only our children's future at stake. What we do as a people, as was the case of Americans before us, will determine which diametrically opposed system of governance—freedom or tyranny—will shape the world and human events for generations to come.

Today, radical Islam can be, must be, and will be thwarted. Yes, it is a threat that is now upon us. Radical Islamists, however, are not only butchering Christians and Jews, but a multitude of Muslims as well. And yes, forces of modernity within the Muslim world who are themselves threatened with extermination will help us defeat this evil plague of radical Islam.

Today, if we remain vigilant and if we remain engaged, we can be confident of this outcome. Yet, as I say, a greater threat is just over the horizon. I am referring to China, a dragon of immense power and insatiable appetite. This challenge will far outshadow the current battle with radical Islam.

China is already engaged, already manipulating, already doing damage, already making serious moves to catapult itself into a position of preeminent power on the Earth. To them, that would simply be moving the center of the Earth back to China where it once was and rightfully should be, from their ethnocentric perception.

Right off, let me assert my intention is not to be a China basher. Surprise, surprise, because I am not a China basher.

China is not the regime that controls that territory, but the people who reside there. They are a people with a magnificent history and culture. Today, over 1 billion Chinese men, women, and children survive in abject poverty. They are in servitude to a small clique, a small, heavy-handed clique, a cadre. Yes. You might say a band of cronies which represents only about 2 percent of the Chinese population. That clique is kept in power by the brutality of their hacks and thugs and the deployment of technology which all too often can be traced back to Western benefactors. With modern Western-developed technologies, they have created a high-tech police state that mirrors the imagination of George Orwell in his prescient novel, “1984.”

The Chinese regime that holds power in Beijing is a hostile force to the freedom of its own people and a threat to us. The hardworking, long-suffering, yet dignified and proud people of China, they are our allies in waiting. Our sympathy and loyalty should focus on them, the Chinese people. Their

greatest hope is our greatest hope, that they will some day demand and win their own freedom and thus shift China into the family of free nations and free people. This should not only be their goal, but our goal as well.

But for now, the aggressively authoritarian and murderous regime in Beijing holds power with an iron fist at home and makes alliances with gangsters and tyrants the world around. The growing power of China is obvious in the confidence and bullishness of its antidemocratic regime, in its leverage as a formidable economic competitor, and its expanding military force.

□ 1700

All of this has been steadily assisted by our own government and by the elite captains of America's finance industry.

These American tycoons still plot, scheme, and invest to make a quick buck by exploiting a massive cheap labor pool and a mega market in China.

It is the same dream of a century and a half ago, when ambitious Western businessmen dreamed of "lighting the lamps of China" and making a fortune doing it. Only now, the fortune is being made by America's elite, but it is not benefiting our country. It is being done at the expense of the American people.

The Chinese regime as of late has been masterful at manipulating the greed and avarice of Western businessmen, even as China itself continues to undermine international financial markets and hammers many of those Western corporations which have already set up there in China.

Beijing maintains a massive pool of near-slave labor to even attract more foreign capital and manufacturing know-how. This is at the same time that they undervalue their own currency to secure the dominance of their exports, even as they enforce the restrictions they have placed entry into their market.

This is not just symptomatic of a nation with gusto to get ahead. They are destroying the economic potential of their future competitors. So much more sophisticated than Mao, the Chinese oligarchs of today look and speak Western. They mean to eclipse our country and, yes, extinguish our ideals of democracy and individual freedom, even as the West stumbles in its retreat before this aggressive and autocratic global force.

Wake up, America. We are not only losing jobs to an ever more powerful China, but we are in the process of losing our security, our prosperity, and, yes, our freedom. We are losing more than jobs. We are losing our future. Wake up, America.

If eventually the United States and our great democratic experiment is defeated through the avarice and shortsightedness of grasping corporations and their bought-and-paid-for political hacks, who will be able to light the lamps of freedom, not only in China, but around the world?

There is no shortage of power-monsters who would cast the world into darkness and deprivation and fear. As evil expands America is, as it has always been, the only hope for a better world, the only hope for the world's oppressed, the only hope for stability and peace.

Six decades ago, Japanese militarists understood the role of America. That is why they attacked us at Pearl Harbor, so they could push us out of the picture and they could then dominate the Asia Pacific region with a greater sphere of co-prosperity and, of course, a brutally enforced stability.

The Chinese strategists now see us in the same light as the Japanese planners did before World War II. The Japanese, however, only intended to dominate a large chunk of the Pacific region. Today, China's rulers seek domination not just of the Asian Pacific region, but of the world. They are positioning themselves to do just that.

And what has been America's counterstrategy? Apparently, to establish economic ties that will build China's economy, thinking that with prosperity will come a new hospitable and benevolent attitude among the Chinese hierarchy.

So our country club class of American businessmen have built China into an economic giant and, yes, a global power. And, of course, these captains of American industry have made big bucks for themselves, personally, as part of this effort in building China.

America's corporate elite has not seemed to notice the obvious downside for their fellow Americans in sending jobs, capital, and technology to China. Maybe the brutal consequences on the rest of the American family of free people was obscured by the worst kind of wishful thinking. Elite think tanks, coffers filled by corporate giants, I might add these intellectual think tanks, intellectually claimed and have claimed that if you hug a dragon, it won't eat you. Well, the subsidized academics assured us, if we treat it nicely, it will become a warm and peaceful dragon. Well, look again. It has been decades of coddling, and it is still a dragon. It is bigger and stronger and still hungry.

The frightening result of our folly and betrayal of American working people is becoming evident. In the month of February 2010 alone, the trade deficit with China was a staggering \$16.5 billion. In 1984, just 25 years ago, the U.S. had a trade surplus with China. Our annual trade imbalance with China is now \$227 billion and rising. Our lamp is going out.

China holds the largest amount of American bonds than any nation and holds the highest percentage of our debt, and has repeatedly threatened to quietly dump those bonds and devastate our national economy if we don't comply with its wishes.

What is their goal?

First, of course, it is to maintain their unfair trade advantage built on

near-slave labor, environmental desolation, devalued currency, and a heavily restricted access to their market, while enjoying access to our market and a continual flow of U.S. investment and technology and know-how into their country. Yet, now if we move to correct the imbalance by seeking equality and fairness in our trade policies, there will be a heavy price for us to pay. So we just let a bad situation continue to slide, even as our economy, our power, and our influence slide into an abyss.

The dragon may not be a Marxist red dragon, but it is still a dragon, dangerous as hell, and will not be deterred by appeasement or cowardice. Economic vulnerability is only half of the story.

On a parallel track, financed by their profits from this one-way free trade imbalance that they have enjoyed, China is engaged in an unprecedented military build-up. Communist China's military forces, which include nuclear, cyber, and space-based and conventional and terrorist components are on the rise, as our defenses are wearing thin and exhausted. In the past, we have always been able to rely on our technological superiority, "in the past" being the operative words in the sentence I just used. Yes, in the past we could rely on our technological superiority.

Today, new China laws demand that Western companies, who are now operating in China and wish to, give up technological secrets that can be used for economic and military advantage. Our greatest asset to the future is being given away in exchange for a piece of China's market today.

When we had the leverage, our financial and business elites were only looking to short-term profits and benefits for themselves, not for their country. This short-term approach ended up much shorter than expected. The other side now has the leverage, and they are making the best of it. Surprise, surprise. The Chinese elite is a murderous dragon. And, yes, they are still a dragon, and they still intend to eat our lunch. Tomorrow they will eat us.

For decades, American capitalists have rushed to China with stars in their eyes and quick and easy profits on their minds, but it has been a deal with the devil, figuratively and literally. American corporations are not acting as Americans. They have been acting as greedy cowards, reflecting the worst of human aspirations, not the best.

We Americans pride ourselves at being committed to noble, higher ideals. We are not just a grasping horde seeking self-enrichment. We do believe in treating people decently, and we do believe in people's individual rights given to them by God. Well, we think of ourselves that way.

And then we hear that Google and other American companies have enabled the communist Chinese dictatorship to track down dissidents, who are

then jailed for daring to oppose tyranny and corruption or to worship God as they see fit.

Once compromised, companies like Google found themselves curtailing the free flow of information to millions of Chinese citizens, turning the Internet into a tool for repression rather than a facilitator for free expression, and, thus, a vehicle for the advancement of the human condition.

To Google's credit, uncomfortable with the role that it was being forced to play, Google decided not to go along with the heavy handed plan that the Chinese regime expected them to play and to implement.

□ 1710

At great risk to their company, Google's executives refused to go along and took a stand against repression. Yes, kudos to Google for that.

Conversely, shame on the rest of the high-tech entourage who collaborated and were even used to advance tyrannical corruption. Google was not backed up, for example, by Microsoft or Yahoo Internet providers. Now China is preferring to intensify draconian laws requiring telecommunications and Internet companies to inform on customers who discuss state secrets. That term, "state secrets," can be defined as anything from negative economic statistics to information on environmental calamities or references to Tibet, Taiwan, the Falun Gong, Uyghurs or anything else that would anger the dragon. The Chinese regime obviously understands its control of technology is a way to control the future.

Yes, the future. Beijing's focus on space as well as electronic communications says it all. Remember, space-based assets—satellite systems—are a central component of global and national communication, with enormous implications to our own national security as well as our own prosperity. The power of commerce and political change will be determined by the control of these systems, and the freedom to use these systems will have an impact on the future of the country and the world.

What happens in space will determine what happens on the ground. With that in mind, the Obama administration's decision to go along with our domestic, high-tech corporate giants and again permit American satellites to be launched from Chinese rockets is a cataclysmic betrayal of America's security, and it undermines both the future of our aerospace industry and undermines freedom on this planet.

Fifteen years ago, during the Clinton years, a similar decision was made to permit U.S. satellites to be launched on Chinese rockets. We were assured by the Clinton administration that no technology would be transferred. I bought into that for a short time, then it became abundantly evident that this was a technological windfall for the Chinese regime, that President Clinton

had not, as promised, secured that our technology would not be transferred. And when it became clear after the Clinton administration had made that commitment to us that there would be no transfer of technology, and when it became clear that this effort at co-operation was a colossal mistake and that technology was being transferred, no moves were made to limit the damage or shut it down.

Perhaps it had something to do with the fact that Bernard Schwartz's contributions had some impact on President Clinton's reelection bid, meaning Bernie Schwartz was the CEO of Loral Corporation, a company heavily complicit in the illegal transfer of missile technology to China. He was also the biggest single contributor to President Bill Clinton's reelection campaign. Of course, he was not the only contributor to have a stake in this policy of sending missile technology to China. Other contributors to the Clinton campaign were traced and found to be leaders of the PLA, that's the People's Liberation Army missile program, which of course had a different name on their company and a different veneer, the veneer of a private sector and commercial company, but really it was a control company by the People's Liberation Army.

I was personally involved in uncovering the initial evidence that exposed this crime, a crime that made our country vulnerable to missiles that were built with technology that had been developed right here, but the missiles were now aimed at us by a hostile power. A full scale investigation ensued. Christopher Cox led a bipartisan task force which unanimously declared our security had been compromised. Before Congress could finally put the cork in the bottle, clearly invaluable rocket secrets were in the possession of this monstrously antidemocratic dragon regime. The world's worst human abuser now had America's utmost missile technology secrets.

Unlike the last time around, thanks to the help of their American corporate benefactors, now the Chinese rockets are built further along than they were back in those days 15 years ago. Right now the Chinese have rockets, thanks to our help, that are much more competitive with our own systems. Before we stepped in to help, their rocket launchers more often than not turned into fiery failures. And even if successful, Chinese rockets of 15 years ago only carried one payload per launch. Now with our gift of technology—that I might add cost the American people, the American taxpayers, billions of dollars to develop—Chinese rockets are now reliable and capable of launching multiple payloads, be they satellites or warheads. It's called MIRVing, our gift to the Chinese. No wonder they have no respect for us. No wonder they are becoming aggressive. They think we're stupid. They think we're cowards, trying to buy peace with gifts to our enemies.

What else would we expect such tough guys who are in power in Beijing to think? Should they think, oh, how nice it is that the Americans are so willing to give us this power? We should be grateful, and we should be their friends because they are being so nice to us in giving us this technology that can be used for rockets and other high-tech weapons systems.

Well the town of Jiuquan is in the high desert of China's occupied regime of East Turkistan. Located there is China's main space launch center. That is where its Long March rockets and commercial space and nuclear-capable ballistic rockets take off from. At the entrance to this complex at this Chinese launch area is a billboard written half in English intended for the world to see. The statement of the Chinese warlords of this Uyghur province, I might add, says, "Without haste. Without fear. We will conquer the world."

And, yes, America's policies and the collaborations of our corporations are helping them do just that. Instead of facing the reality of the even more powerful and increasingly hungry dragon that is right in front of our face, interest groups and power players in our country keep raising the question about what's happening with China? Are we making China into our enemy?

Yes, so many Americans just love to blame ourselves every time such confrontation with tyranny occurs. During his recent trip to Asia, I half expected to hear that our President had actually bowed down to Chinese despots and apologized for the Opium Wars of 150 years ago. Now of course he didn't do that, but that is the attitude you can see reflected in people who are blaming us for any belligerency that's on the part of the Chinese, or any other enemy of the United States, I might add. This self-flagellation is of course much safer than blaming an increasingly strained relationship on the obvious badness and evil that is going on among the other guys. The obvious tyrants who murder their own people, the people who happen to be the world's worst human rights abuser. Now, maybe it's their fault, but if we blame them for it rather than blame ourselves for the current escalation of hostility that is now evident with the Chinese, we would have to deal with the threat. We have to deal with them. And that would be scary.

So instead, so many Americans end up blaming ourselves or apologizing for past errors that America may have committed or may not have committed. So the answer to our question, is the Chinese regime getting more belligerent, the answer is emphatically, yes, it is getting more belligerent. Is it our fault? No. The attitude of those who rule Beijing is the manifestation of an increasing lust for power and the hubris of the clique that controls the world's most populous country with an iron fist. That is what you would expect from such tyrants. That is why our policy should not be aimed at

building their strength military, economically, or any other way.

□ 1720

Of course, the essence of what's going on has not gone unnoticed by our friends and foes overseas. The perception of American weakness, even decline, eat away at the resolve of our friends and allies even as it contributes to Beijing's cockiness. And let's admit, we are considerably weaker than we ever thought we would be. We have been bled and drained by needlessly expensive small-scale wars around the world as well as a benevolence that has us bankrolling the United Nations and shoving foreign aid out our door even as we borrow money from China.

One example of this is seen in America's good-hearted participation in a global fund designed to provide the world's poorest countries support in the fight against AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and other insidious diseases, which kill millions of people a year. Over the 8 years of the fund's history, the United States has willingly contributed \$4.3 billion—that's more than 28 percent of all the contributions to this benevolent fund—and we should be proud that we are a generous people, even if we can't afford it. Whether we can continue to be so generous as our level of deficit spending threatens to collapse our economy, now that's another question.

But most significant, because of an anomaly in the funding formula, China has been one of the largest recipients of this fund. Over the last 8 years, China has been the recipient of almost \$1 billion in grants. Conversely, over that same period China has only contributed \$16 million to the fund. That's the fund we've given \$4 billion to. I can't come up with one reason of why the American taxpayer should be underwriting the cost of China's public health system. The whole thing is a travesty.

Malaria, for example, is a minor problem in China, killing about 38 individuals a year. On the other hand, malaria is a massive problem in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, killing over 25,000 people last year. Yet in this international fund, China was awarded \$149 million to combat malaria and only \$122 million went to the Congo. That's \$4 million for each case of a malaria death in China while the Congo received \$5,000 per person that had died.

This issue needs to be addressed, but nobody of course has the guts to address it because China is getting about a billion dollars' worth of benefits, paying a pittance, while the United States pays \$4 billion into this fund. What we've been doing in this case is borrowing from China to donate to a fund that gives back to China. Over the years, we then end up paying interest on the debt that's been incurred by this very transaction.

Now, this is the kind of ongoing indefensible transfer of wealth from our

country to China that we have faced, and we've acquiesced with this. We've put up with it for years. It's got to stop. The burdens of drawn-out commitments that we've had all over the world and the irrational benevolence—you can read that "giveaways"—makes our Nation poorer. We're talking about it's diminishing our ability here at home to meet our needs, the needs of our own people, and to watch out for our own security because wealth is being transferred out of our country by policies that we've gone along with. We are now vulnerable after all of this to an unrestricted political, economic, and military threat by a major power like China.

So China is encouraging those who would tie us down and drain our energy. This is part of their effort. They have been helping those people who have been trying to tie us down and to drain our energies and revenues and our resources. This is part of their effort to disable us by sapping our willpower, our resolve, and our resources. And as we become weaker, China's unquenchable thirst for natural resources such as oil, natural gas, and scarce minerals that are necessary for modern manufacturing, this has spurred China to become the ally, supplier, protected, and puppet master of rogue regimes on a global scale.

And the Chinese planetary offensive is evident in countries like North Korea, Burma, Cambodia, Iran, and across Africa, like Sudan and Zimbabwe. Not only are their people being repressed by regimes that are tyrannical but these are regimes that have allied themselves with Beijing, which is becoming the leading—it is already the world's worst human rights abuser and it is the creator of alliances with dictators throughout the world.

It's hard to miss that when China establishes an alliance with these countries what its intention is. We need to look no further than to show that China has an alliance and is providing arms with the anti-American blowhard in our hemisphere, the would-be caudillo of Latin American, Venezuela's Hugo Chavez. So it's evident elsewhere. Wherever trouble and turmoil threaten U.S. interests, we can find that China has a hand in this.

Nuclear weapons and missiles technology were slipped to Iran by China via North Korea and Pakistan, and they have added a dangerous instability to the Middle East. In light of this, there should be no mystery as to why China in the United Nations and in other international forums has opposed stronger and enforceable sanctions against Iran and North Korea.

North Korea's sinking of a South Korean naval patrol ship not that long ago, there was a loss of 46 South Korean sailors, and it was publicly treated as a nonevent by Beijing, although it's right there in its backyard. In fact, North Korea's eccentric dictator, who probably could not be in power without Chinese support, was given an official

heroes' welcome in China just days after it sunk a South Korean ship, which cost the lives of 46 South Korean sailors.

More recently, China has bullied Japan over the control and sovereignty of islands that are not even close to its shores. While it was doing the bullying of Japan, our great ally, the United States was warned by China to butt out and stay away from those islands. "Aggressive" and "belligerent" are words that come to mind when you're trying to analyze what's the nature of the Chinese regime in these situations.

And then there is, of course, Pakistan with its "Islamic bomb." Never forget the Pakistanis are in a strategic partnership with China even while we give them billions of dollars to bolster Pakistan's terminally ill economy. The Chinese gave Pakistan critical nuclear weapons technology. This is insanity. We are borrowing more from China to give to Pakistan, which is an ally of China, even as Pakistan builds its Islamic bomb with the help of China and continues to help the Taliban, who are at this moment killing U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan.

Wake up, America. We can't continue with this kind of insanity.

The opening by Iran of a new missile production plant in March of 2010 enabled Iran to quickly expand its supply of NASR anti-ship missiles. Yep, it was another China deal. Not long after that, a Hezbollah-Iranian cruise missile knocked out an Israeli ship. Aha. Yes, another gift from China. And what is the response of the Obama administration to all these transfers of lethal weapons of mass destruction by China to rogue nations? Well, there have been no penalties imposed, even on the state-owned Chinese companies that are conducting these weapons transfers. Even worse, Washington is again considering letting Chinese rockets launch U.S. satellites. I guess they need to upgrade their system so they can pass even more updated weapons on to their criminal buddies.

China's increasingly aggressive and threatening foreign policy are matched at home by severe repression. Millions of religious believers in China are facing increased not decreased oppression. The abuse is indiscriminate, whether they are Christians, Tibetans, Buddhists, Muslims. The most savage treatment, of course, is dealt out to the Falun Gong members. Falun Gong are just yoga and meditation practitioners. They've been tortured, thrown into prison camps, slave labor camps. They have been murdered and their organs have been cut out and sold by the Chinese health industry to the highest bidders, many of whom are Americans. This is the most ghoulish of all repressions. And it continues with devastating intensity.

□ 1730

Then again, maybe all this evil is due to the fact that we Americans are just so belligerent to the Chinese.

What?

Yes, some people want to blame us, so let's reach out to the dragon, not with a clenched fist but with an open hand, with a positive attitude and, most of all, with kindness, not hostility, and with lots of investment money as well, of course, and with lots of technology and secrets.

Give me a break. Wake up, America. This has got to stop.

This nonsense has led to some of America's military's top commanders to misguidedly welcome China's military leaders to visit our own defense centers and our own international defense forums with our Asian Pacific allies and to permit Chinese military personnel to observe our military exercises. One can only guess that the strategy behind this outreach and inclusion is the idea that it will somehow charm the Chinese into thinking of us as their friends, not as their rivals. Hug a dragon and it won't be a dragon.

Well, is it not evident that the very existence of our democracy is what intimidates and enrages the Chinese antidemocratic dictatorship as with all of these dictatorships in the past? It is certainly not a comparison of how many ships we have and airplanes we have as compared to theirs, which has brought on this animosity from Beijing. Beijing knows that the United States has no intention of attacking them. However, like the Japanese before World War II, they know that America is the only power with the courage and the ability to stand between them and their goal, which is one of total domination of a large segment of the world and a heavy-handed influence on the rest.

Perhaps the worst aspect of this looming security crisis is that China's aggressive military modernization has been made possible by its rising trade surplus with the United States. We have unintentionally financed their economy and have built their economy at the expense of jobs and manufacturing at home, and they are using the residual profits from their economic transactions with us to build weapons, very good weapons—better weapons than we may have available to us in the future. Their intent is to back us off and to destroy us as a dynamic force in the world.

In 1998, the People's Liberation Army's publishing company openly published a book that is publicly available, called "Unrestricted Warfare." The strategist's guidelines in that book called for using economic destabilization, computer viruses, information deception, terrorism, and devastating modern military weapons, including biochemical and nuclear weapons.

Among those things highlighted in this Chinese strategy book were two individuals—Osama bin Laden and George Soros. Bin Laden was cited because terror and guerilla groups historically are thought to have bled empires to the point that they could be defeated by a rival power. Soros was li-

onized because he had mastered the art of manipulating the currencies of countries around the world, from England to Malaysia to Thailand, thus dramatically weakening those countries.

The People's Liberation authors in that book openly stated that, if individuals could accomplish such things, then China, as an emerging power with focused strategic weapons in cyber and deep space, could bring down and defeat a great power such as the United States.

The greatest threat to America's future generations may well be the high-tech strategic and exotic weapons China will possess as a result of advances made in recent years. China's strategic economic position should also be noted with alarm. Global competition over scarce natural resources is intensifying. Armed with advanced weapons and flush with money earned from its American trade imbalance, Beijing has been allying with, buying off and bribing the gangster regimes of the underdeveloped nations of the world, and these same regimes, of course, control the rich energy and finite mineral resources in their countries.

These are not the actions and maneuvers of a government that wants to be part of the world's trading system, that wants to be part of the Family of Nations. These are the actions and maneuvers of a tyrannical dictatorship that is striving to dominate the world in alliance with other dictatorships.

Do you think that such people might sink so low as to bribe the decision-makers at the World Trade Organization or at the United Nations?

When you hear people say that we should solve these issues, that we must always go multilaterally and come at world peace via part of an international effort, just remember it takes American courage to stand up. If we try to go through the World Trade Organization or the United Nations, we are going to find out someday that the Chinese have bribed those people in the World Trade Organization and in the U.N. If they haven't done it already, they will do it in the future to protect their international acquisitions in Asia, Africa, and South America.

China's People's Liberation Army is certainly a threat, but the Navy that it is building is also a threat because China is building a lethal surface ship and submarine flotilla. They are making outlandish claims now while at the same time building up their fleet for the right to control large ocean areas, like the entire South China Sea. Their naval forces are beginning to have routine patrols around the world's most vital sea lanes and communication and trade lanes.

Indeed, between 1987 and 2009, while the U.S. submarine force was cut in half, China's Navy commissioned 31 new attack submarines. Their new model diesel subs are nearly undetectable by U.S. and allied naval forces, and they are deploying a new

missile that can take out a U.S. aircraft carrier 900 miles away. Nevertheless, on February 19, 2009, The New York Times reported that U.S. Pacific Commander Admiral Keating offered the U.S. Navy to assist China in learning how to operate its own aircraft carriers. Boy, that's going to make the world safer. We're going to teach them how to run their aircraft carriers.

Worth noting, a senior Chinese military officer proclaimed that once the Chinese get their aircraft carriers that the United States can claim Hawaii east, and China will take Hawaii west and the Indian Ocean. "Then you will not need to patrol the western Pacific anymore," he said.

How nice. This while we are reducing our own fleet. They are telling us to stay out of a certain area of the world and to stay out of it while they are bullying Japan over some islands in the middle of nowhere. Tomorrow, they are going to declare that they have the rightful domination of over half of the Pacific.

Wake up, America. Don't just look to the ocean for the threat. Look up. Space, the high ground of any future conflict, will soon no longer be our domain, America's domain. It is already now no longer our domain, obviously. China is aggressively moving forward, yes, in the exploration of space but also in space-based and related weapons systems.

In 2006, for example, the U.S. Department of Defense reported that China used a ground-based laser to blind certain U.S. satellites. In January 2007, the People's Liberation Army successfully used an antisatellite missile to intercept a weather satellite. They've blown their satellites out of orbit without any care for the fact that they left heavy debris that threatened all other space activity in that area of space.

No need to complain, of course, because these guys aren't listening.

China's supposed civilian space program has made spectacular gains. Much of it can be traced back to the tech transfer that happened during the Clinton administration, which has now been incorporated into China's rockets and its missiles.

Again, if our aerospace is at risk, blame us. Don't blame them. We gave them the technology. But we can blame them for commissioning hundreds of spies who have penetrated U.S. defense companies and agencies to steal the blueprints and charts needed to enhance their weapons systems. They have a monstrous organized effort for attacking and stealing America's technological secrets by breaking into our computer systems. Yes, we can blame them for that, but we just keep inviting them to observe our military exercises and—oh, yes—teaching them how to use aircraft carriers.

Today, almost every part of the western and central United States is under the potential threat of the increased capability of China's weapons systems. We have given them our secrets. By

agreeing to a trade policy that has been unfair, uneven, and a drain on America's wealth and technology, we have provided them the resources to use this technology, to expand and to modernize their own military.

□ 1740

By agreeing to a trade policy that has been unfair, uneven, and a drain on America's wealth and technology we have provided them the resources to use this technology and to expand and modernize their own military.

Such stupidity is nothing new. Before World War II, there was an effort by the Brits to invest in Hitler's Germany to build economic ties that would prevent conflict. Boy, did that work. And it wasn't just Britain's deal where they betrayed Czech security that convinced Hitler that the West was gutless. It was also British money invested in his country in the 1930s.

We gave the Japanese scrap metal and oil even as they raped China. Eventually the Japanese mayhem in China was too much, even for American capitalists. Not enough, however, to discourage corporate interests from negotiating the sale of, for example, B-17 blueprints to Japan as late as 1940. They never consummated that deal because the attack on Pearl Harbor shortened those negotiations.

Today, we're giving the Chinese our genius and the benefit of our R&D worth billions of dollars, and it's *deja vu* all over again. Foreign and U.S. satellite operators are maneuvering to loosen the security export controls on the launching of advanced communications satellite systems on PLA—that's People's Liberation Army—controlled rockets and then the companies that make those rockets. Oh, yes, China is offering 30 to 50 percent below market price in order to attract those launches. I wonder why. They must just want to do us favor, or maybe they just remember the last time they made such agreements with American companies and ended up with billions of dollars of American technology that they now have to use against us. What a great deal.

Our big companies make a couple of hundred billion dollars in profit by co-operating with the Chinese rather than launching with U.S. companies. Certain CEO's add a couple million dollar bonuses to themselves for providing short-term savings, and that savings comes from using Chinese rockets. The Chinese end up with access to defense-related research and development that costs the taxpayers billions of dollars. The Chinese have new technologies to defeat us in the future. We have short-term profit and big bonuses for our CEO's in the present. What a deal. It's a raw deal for the American aerospace industry and for our children's safety, and it will put us in jeopardy by using our own technology to put us in jeopardy.

Let me be clear. Letting the Chinese launch U.S. satellites is wrong. Such

launches will put money in the pockets of the People's Liberation Army to facilitate their own aggressive space programs. It will help the People's Liberation Army perfect its missile technology, and it will strangle in the cradle the private launch companies that are now emerging in the United States, which will then leave us totally dependent on China for space transportation.

To accomplish this nefarious goal, launching U.S. satellites on Chinese rockets, the U.S. law will have to be changed in order to accomplish that. One way for this to be accomplished is for the Obama administration, like the Clinton administration before, to sign a Presidential waiver of the Tiananmen Square human rights sanctions. Don't miss one crucial fact. The Chinese national space program apparatus is owned and controlled—it's not a private group like in the United States, like Boeing—it is controlled by the People's Liberation Army. Their profits go to the People's Liberation Army. The three main Chinese space entities are all under People's Liberation Army control. All three of these have been repeatedly sanctioned by the U.S. government for proliferation of missile technologies to countries including Iran and Pakistan.

Wake up, America. They are planning to play us for suckers like they already have in the past. Well, they are trying to play us that way because we're acting that way. This shouldn't even be an issue except, of course, the Chinese have the best lobbyists in Washington, the best lobbyists money can buy, and they've also got the lobbyists from U.S. corporations who are working with them, doing their bidding. And even better, they can buy off the so-called think tanks.

What we've got is money from these corporations doing business in China who are putting that money into think tanks, which then come and testify before Congress about different policies that would, of course, affect whether or not we make decisions like the one I'm talking about.

And who's left out, of course? What we're talking about is the American worker who has been put permanently out of work and the American people who are now in jeopardy. So now the Chinese are using their excessive profit to buy influence here at the expense of the American people. Wake up, America.

A critical event of the cold war was China's repositioning, which put them in friendly relations with the United States and against the Soviet Union. Later when I worked for President Reagan, it was hoped that direct communication and economic ties would result in a permanent, positive change that would better the lives and freedom of the Chinese people. Unlike his predecessors or those who came later, Reagan understood that peace would only be furthered if freedom was simultaneously expanded as we increased

economic activity. Reagan made it clear as he visited China in 1985. I worked with him on those speeches. I actually know very well what the message was of the speeches that Reagan gave in China.

If China continued to open up politically and to liberalize, America would keep its markets open and would be investing and trying to uplift the Chinese people.

In 1989, the Tiananmen Square massacre of the Chinese democracy movement was the tipping point. President Reagan, who was committed to human rights and democracy, was no longer President. President Reagan's successors have not been so committed to human rights and democracy. The Chinese ruling clique paid no serious price for this brutal, monstrous atrocity against the democracy movement at Tiananmen Square. Neither President Bush nor Clinton did anything even as the Chinese Communist Party retrenched themselves in power with blood and steel and murder.

And since Tiananmen Square, the repression in that country has gotten worse and worse and worse, not better, and we've continued acting like buddies. That's our offensive, our buddy offensive. Our policies have not been reformed. Our policies have not reformed the tyrannical system in China. In fact, we have expanded it because they have come to believe they can do anything to their own people, repression, build any kind of military threat, and we will still grant them economic policies that will enable the wealth to flow in their direction, even as it is unfair to our own people.

China is a Frankenstein monster of our own making, a monster that now threatens the world peace, economics, and democratic evolution. One would think as this threat becomes ever more clear that there would be some change in our policy, but no, the insanity continues.

Not long ago, there was a highly publicized visit to China by Secretary Hillary Clinton, who brought a legion of reporters with her to the Shanghai World Fair. Secretary Clinton proudly showed them an American exhibition hall built with \$60 million in contributions from American corporations. How nice—the companies paid to build an exhibition hall. Unfortunately, it was so vapid and uninspiring without a hint of love of democracy and freedom that reflects the core values of the American people. No, the so-called charity's leader of that pavilion, who built that hall in Beijing, Frank Lavin, explained why there wasn't any reference to freedom or democracy, "We're not trying to be provocative" or "insulting" to the Chinese viewers, he said.

What does all that say about us? What does it say about them? Secretary Clinton, being as uninspiring as she is, pointed out that the world's fair was introducing America to the world as a rising power, according to our Secretary of State. This world's fair is a

coming out party also for China. Well, it is really of historical significance, she said. Yeah, it is of historical significance. It's basically saying that America doesn't care about freedom and democracy. China is coming out, that's right. A new style of 21st century tyranny is being created with Chinese characteristics that fuses the control mechanisms of Communism with corporate funding and high-tech savvy.

The leadership of this potential juggernaut has global ambitions and is ruthless and persistent. We need to undo any optimistically generous policies that have been giving away our industrial base and transferring resources and power to China.

□ 1750

Most importantly, however, through our actions we must reaffirm to ourselves and to the world our commitment to the ideals that made this country strong and democratic, a role model for humanity, regardless of culture or language.

Advocates of our current China policy promised peace and mutual prosperity and the expansion of freedom as China grew stronger. Yet the stronger China has become, the more repressive it has gotten. We thought we were creating a peaceful new member of the international community. But instead we've shifted power to a government that remains the world's worst human rights abuser, repressing its own people while building its military and making aggressive claims on boundaries and territorial waters that threaten its neighbors, as well as the flow of international commerce through long-established shipping lanes.

Exchanges, like the World's Fair exhibits, were supposed to promote U.S. values. Investment in Chinese manufacturing was supposed to have led to liberalization of their society. Where are the reforms? Where are the benevolent liberals who were going to democratize China? You know where they are? They're in jail. They're in prison, or they've been murdered by the regime. They sit in cells right next to uncompromising religious leaders, believers, and the Falun Gong practitioners.

Crackdowns on dissent, religious freedom, and free speech have escalated in Tibet; missiles facing Taiwan have grown to more than 1,400 in the past few years; and the cyberdestabilization on a global scale is often traced back to the Chinese military facilities. These things should be alarm bells for all people who want peace and believe in freedom.

This is an enemy who has no shame and, perhaps, as we show weakness, has no fear. It is an enemy that hates religion and sees freedom and human rights as an anarchistic evil that needs to be obliterated. This is the threat over the horizon, a dragon which has been made stronger, more aggressive, and more hungry as a result of misguided American policies. Those policies must be changed. We must have

the resolve to meet this evermore and present challenge.

China is not the only society that honors its ancestors and forefathers. We must respect the sacrifices and legacies for all those brave Americans who worked, struggled, fought, and often perished for our freedom, for liberty, for justice, for the rights of every person. These principles are what not only bind us together as a people but bond us with people of every land, especially those people in China and others who are oppressed by dictators, those people who long for freedom. It is their success in reforming and transforming their country, in throwing off their chains of oppression, and in doing so, they will free us from the threat of a powerful dragon country as they create a peaceful and a democratic and prosperous country with which we can trade and have equal and positive relations.

If we have courage and stand tall, the next century will not be the century of China. It will be the century of free people, technologically united throughout the globe, united in respect for the rights of people everywhere and committed to respecting each other and the building of a more peaceful, prosperous, and free world.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1421. An act to amend section 42 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation and shipment of certain species of carp; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 22, 2010, at noon, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 332, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

TOM REED, New York, Twenty-Ninth.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie*, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, John H. Adler, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marlon Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boccieri, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany Jr., Allen Boyd, Bruce L. Braley, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bobby Bright, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Ginny Brown-Waite, Henry E. Brown Jr., Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G.K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Anh "Joseph" Cao, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Travis W.

Childers, Judy Chu, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Kathleen A. Dahlkemper, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Nathan Deal*, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Bill Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charles W. Dent, Theodore E. Deutch, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Charles Djou, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Steve Driehaus, John J. Duncan Jr., Chet Edwards, Donna F. Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Mary Fallin, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, John Fleming, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Gabrielle Giffords, Kirsten E. Gillibrand*, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Parker Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, John J. Hall, Ralph M. Hall, Deborah L. Halvorson, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, Gregg Harper, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth Sandlin, Brian Higgins, Baron P. Hill, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Paul W. Hodes, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Duncan Hunter, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy

V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Steve Kagen, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Mary Jo Kilroy, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Ann Kirkpatrick, Larry Kissell, Ron Klein, John Kline, Suzanne M. Kosmas, Frank Kratovil Jr., Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher John Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh*, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. “Buck” McKeon, Michael E. McMahon, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Connie Mack, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Betsy Markey, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Eric J.J. Massa*, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Walt Minnick, Harry E. Mitchell, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Christopher S. Murphy, Patrick J. Murphy, Scott Murphy, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha*, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Devin Nunes, Glenn C. Nye, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Pete Olson, Solomon P. Ortiz, William L. Owens, Frank Pallone Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Thomas S.P. Perriello, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph

R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Earl Pomeroy, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Adam H. Putnam, Mike Quigley, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Silvestre Reyes, Laura Richardson, Ciro D. Rodriguez, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers (AL-03), Mike Rogers (MI-08), Dana Rohrabacher, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Sablan, John T. Salazar, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Scott, Robert C. “Bobby” Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Joe Sestak, John B. Shadegg, Mark Shauer, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis*, Mark E. Souder*, Zachary T. Space, Jackie Speier, John M. Spratt Jr., Bart Stupak, Marlin A. Stutzman, Cliff Stearns, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher*, Gene Taylor, Harry Teague, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Greg Walden, Timothy J. Walz, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Diane Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler*, Ed Whitfield, Charles A. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DAVE GRIMALDI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 17 AND AUG. 21, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Dave Grimaldi	8/17	8/18	Gabon
	8/18	8/19	Uganda
	8/19	8/21	Ghana
Committee total

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVE GRIMALDI, Oct. 7, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 12, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	9/08	9/10	Canada	416.00	(3)	416.00
Hon. Ed Markey	9/09	9/09	Canada	302.00	1,436.28	1,738.28
Hon. Wilson Livingood	9/08	9/10	Canada	416.00	(3)	416.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	9/08	9/10	Canada	562.00	969.73	1,531.73
John Lawrence	9/08	9/12	Canada	1,208.00	903.03	2,111.03
Stacey Bako	9/08	9/10	Canada	604.00	3,414.33	2,018.33
Wyndee Parker	9/08	9/10	Canada	604.00	3,304.63	3,908.63
Karen Wayland	9/08	9/09	Canada	302.00	969.73	1,271.73
Andrew Hamill	9/08	9/10	Canada	581.41	969.73	1,551.14
Bridget Fallon	9/06	9/10	Canada	1,208.00	1,033.15	2,241.15

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 12, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kate Knudson	9/08	9/10	Canada		604.00		969.73				1,573.73
Morgan Gray	9/08	9/09	Canada		302.00		969.73				1,271.73
Tina Agee	9/08	9/10	Canada		604.00		969.73				1,573.73
* THIS IS AN AMENDMENT TO FORM FILED 10/08/2010											
Committee total											21,623.21

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, Oct. 21, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 12, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	9/08	9/10	Canada		416.00		(³)				416.00
Hon. Ed Markey	9/08	9/09	Canada		302.00		1,436.28				1,738.28
Hon. Wilson Livingood	9/08	9/10	Canada		416.00		(³)				416.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	9/08	9/10	Canada		562.00		969.73				1,531.73
John Lawrence	9/08	9/12	Canada		1,173.00		903.03				2,076.03
Stacey Bako	9/08	9/10	Canada		604.00		³ 1,414.33				2,018.33
Wyndee Parker	9/08	9/10	Canada		604.00		3,304.63				3,908.63
Karen Wayland	9/08	9/09	Canada		302.00		969.73				1,271.73
Andrew Hamill	9/08	9/10	Canada		581.41		969.73				1,551.14
Bridget Fallon	9/06	9/10	Canada		1,208.00		1,033.15				2,241.15
Kate Knudson	9/08	9/10	Canada		604.00		969.73				1,573.73
Morgan Gray	9/08	9/09	Canada		302.00		969.73				1,271.73
Tina Agee	9/08	9/10	Canada		604.00		969.73				1,573.73
Committee total											21,588.21

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, Oct. 8, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Scott R. Kuschmider, staff	8/08	8/13	Uganda		1,164.00		3,352.50				4,516.50
Michael D. Dunlap, staff	8/08	8/13	Uganda		1,164.00		3,352.50				4,516.50
Scott R. Kuschmider, staff	8/13	8/18	Kenya		1,492.00						1,492.00
Michael D. Dunlap, staff	8/13	8/18	Kenya		1,492.00						1,492.00
Committee total					5,312.00		6,705.00				12,017.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON, Chairman, Oct. 27, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Scott R. Kuschmider, staff	8/08	8/13	Uganda		1,164.00		3,352.50				4,516.50
Michael D. Dunlap, staff	8/08	8/13	Uganda		1,164.00		3,352.50				4,516.50
Scott R. Kuschmider, staff	8/13	8/18	Kenya		1,926.00						1,926.00
Michael D. Dunlap, staff	8/13	8/18	Kenya		1,926.00						1,926.00
Committee total					6,180.00		6,705.00				12,885.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON, Chairman, Oct. 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John Blazey	7/6	7/7	Yemen		444.00						444.00
Commercial airfare	7/7	7/8	Lebanon		494.00						494.00
Shalanda Young	7/13	7/14	Mali				9,047.40				9,047.40
Commercial airfare							3,748.40				3,748.40
Hon. Barbara Lee	7/17	7/19	Austria		1,360.00				1,062.68		2,422.68
Misc. Embassy Costs									1,014.21		1,014.21
Commercial airfare							1,248.40				1,248.40

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michele Sumilas	8/6	8/8	U.A.E.		368.00						368.00
Commercial airfare	8/8	8/11	Afghanistan		84.00						84.00
BG Wright							3,184.50				3,184.50
Commercial airfare	8/8	8/10	Spain		677.99						677.99
Israel	8/10	8/13	Israel		1,308.00		373.00				1,681.00
Italy	8/13	8/15	Italy		1,041.82						1,041.82
Commercial airfare							5,938.59				5,938.59
Celes Hughes	8/9	8/11	Lebanon		397.00		155.00				552.00
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/13	Turkey		590.00						590.00
Anne Marie Chotvacs	8/9	8/11	Lebanon		397.00		9,148.30				9,148.30
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/13	Turkey		590.00		155.00				552.00
Commercial airfare							9,148.30				9,148.30
Beverly Aimaro Pheto	8/13	8/19	India		1,944.00			407.07			2,351.07
Commercial airfare							5,460.60				5,460.60
Shalanda Young	8/13	8/19	India		1,944.00			407.07			2,351.07
Commercial airfare							5,460.60				5,460.60
Jennifer Miller	8/17	8/20	Saudi Arabia		1,208.40						1,208.40
Commercial airfare	8/20	8/21	Djibouti		454.00		102.00		15.00		571.00
Jeff Shockey	8/17	8/20	Saudi Arabia		1,208.40		9,568.49				9,568.49
Commercial airfare	8/20	8/21	Djibouti		454.00		55.00		15.00		1,223.40
Commercial airfare							9,568.49				509.00
Craig Higgins	8/17	8/18	Dominican Republic		500.00						500.00
Commercial airfare	8/18	8/19	Haiti		118.00						118.00
Steve Marchese	8/17	8/18	Dominican Republic		500.00						500.00
Commercial airfare	8/18	8/19	Haiti		118.00						118.00
Michele Sumilas	8/17	8/18	Dominican Republic		250.00		623.80				623.80
Commercial airfare	8/18	8/19	Haiti		236.00		9,568.49				250.00
Commercial airfare							561.20				236.00
Hon. Jack Kingston	8/22	8/25	Argentina		979.39		(³)				561.20
Commercial airfare	8/25	8/28	Brazil		1,432.69		(³)				979.39
Colombia	8/28	8/29	Colombia		374.00		(³)				1,432.69
Japan	8/28	9/3	Japan		2,316.00		(³)				374.00
Commercial airfare							6,301.50				2,316.00
Sylvia Garcia	8/28	9/3	Japan		2,316.00						6,301.50
Commercial airfare							1,294.50				2,316.00
Laura Hogthead	8/28	9/3	Japan		2,316.00						1,294.50
Commercial airfare							6,301.50				2,316.00
Matthew McCardie	8/28	9/3	Japan		2,316.00						6,301.50
Commercial airfare							11,439.00				2,316.00
Hon. James Moran	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				11,439.00
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Hon. Harold Rogers	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Hon. Tom Cole	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Paul Terry	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Marjorie Duske	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Jeff Shockey	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
Ann Reese	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32
BG Wright	8/29	8/30	En Route		12.39		(³)				24.78
Commercial airfare	8/30	8/31	Greece		253.06		(³)				12.39
U.A.E.	8/31	9/1	U.A.E.		407.48		(³)				253.06
Afghanistan	9/1	9/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				407.48
U.A.E.	9/2	9/3	U.A.E.		415.48		(³)				28.00
Italy	9/3	9/5	Italy		589.32		(³)		36.96		415.48
En Route	9/5	9/5	En Route		24.78		(³)				589.32

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Taunja Berquam	8/30	9/3	UK		1,458.00		170.41				1,628.41
Commercial airfare							2,041.10				2,041.10
Robert Blair	8/30	9/3	UK		1,458.00		130.41				1,588.41
Commercial airfare							2,041.10				2,041.10
Hon. Debbie Wasserman Schultz	9/5	9/7	Israel		292.00						292.00
Commercial airfare							11,660.00				11,660.00
Hon. Steve Israel	9/5	9/7	Israel		292.00						292.00
Commercial airfare							7,072.00				7,072.00
Committee total					47,811.28		122,622.39		3,253.67		173,687.34

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID R. OBEY, Chairman, Oct. 28, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Lebanon, July 5–9, 2010, With STAFFDEL Kuiken: Mark Lewis	7/6	7/8	Lebanon		494.00						494.00
Commercial transportation							8,532.80				8,532.80
Visit to Afghanistan and Germany, July 5–10, 2010: Hon. Carol Shea-Porter	7/6	7/6	Germany		105.25						105.25
.....	7/7	7/8	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	7/9	7/9	Germany		105.25						105.25
Hon. Michael Turner	7/6	7/6	Germany		74.58						74.58
.....	7/7	7/8	Afghanistan								
.....	7/9	7/9	Germany		74.57						74.57
Debra Wada	7/6	7/6	Germany		99.88						99.88
.....	7/7	7/8	Afghanistan								
.....	7/9	7/9	Germany		99.87						99.87
Kari Bingen	7/6	7/6	Germany		98.38						98.38
.....	7/7	7/8	Afghanistan								
.....	7/9	7/9	Germany		98.37						98.37
Visit to Germany, India, Thailand, July 29–August 6, 2010, With CODEL Ruppertsberger: Hon. Duncan Hunter	7/31	8/1	Germany		350.01						350.01
.....	8/1	8/2	India		163.84						163.84
Commercial transportation							3,057.20				3,057.20
Visit to Dubai, Oman, Afghanistan, Bahrain, July 31–August 5, 2010: Hon. Gene Taylor	8/1	8/2	Oman		139.00						139.00
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	8/1	8/2	Oman		139.00						139.00
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Hon. Glenn Nye	8/1	8/2	Oman		139.00						139.00
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Hon. Mark Critz	8/1	8/2	Oman		139.00						139.00
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Hon. Joe Wilson	8/1	8/2	Oman		139.00						139.00
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Hon. Mike Conaway	8/1	8/2	Oman								
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		36.83						36.83
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Josh Holly	8/1	8/2	Oman		139.00						139.00
.....	8/2	8/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
.....	8/3	8/4	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial airfare							8,123.70				8,123.70
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, August 10–14, 2010: Paul Arcangeli	8/11	8/12	Kuwait		447.24						447.24
.....	8/12	8/13	Iraq								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Debra Wada	8/11	8/12	Kuwait		447.24						447.24
.....	8/12	8/13	Iraq								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Tim McClees	8/11	8/12	Kuwait		447.24						447.24
.....	8/12	8/13	Iraq								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Pete Villano	8/11	8/12	Kuwait		447.24						447.24
.....	8/12	8/13	Iraq								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Tom Hawley	8/11	8/12	Kuwait		447.24						447.24
.....	8/12	8/13	Iraq								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Visit to Lebanon, Turkey, August 8–13, 2010, With STAFFDEL Hughes: Roger Zakheim	8/9	8/11	Lebanon		394.00						394.00
.....	8/11	8/13	Turkey		614.88						614.88
Commercial airfare							9,148.30				9,148.30

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Mongolia, China, August 22–28, 2010: Mark Lewis	8/23	8/27	Mongolia		702.00						702.00
Commercial airfare	8/28	8/29	China		95.00						95.00
							8,656.50				8,656.50
Visit to Afghanistan, United Arab Emirates, Jordan, August 24–28, 2010, With CODEL Baird: Hon. Rick Larsen	8/25	8/26	United Arab Emirates		135.00						135.00
	8/26	8/27	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Commercial airfare	8/28	8/28	Jordan				8,441.10				8,441.10
Visit to Serbia, Montenegro, Croatia, August 29–September 6, 2010, With CODEL Delahunt: Hon. Michael Turner	8/30	9/1	Serbia		216.00						216.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00						762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		460.00						460.00
Visit to Malta, Lebanon, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Georgia, September 1–7, 2010, With CODEL Marshall: Hon. Jim Marshall	9/1	9/2	Malta		268.90						268.90
	9/2	9/2	Lebanon								
	9/2	9/4	Pakistan		80.00						80.00
	9/4	9/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Commercial transportation	9/5	9/7	Georgia		570.00		1,404.00				570.00
Tom Hawley	9/1	9/2	Malta		268.90						268.90
	9/2	9/2	Lebanon								
	9/2	9/4	Pakistan		80.00						80.00
	9/4	9/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Commercial transportation	9/5	9/7	Georgia		570.00		785.00				570.00
Peter Villano	9/1	9/2	Malta		224.90						224.90
	9/2	9/2	Lebanon								
	9/2	9/4	Pakistan		40.00						40.00
	9/4	9/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Commercial transportation	9/5	9/7	Georgia		532.00		785.00				532.00
Visit to Canada, September 9–10, 2010: Dave Kildee	9/9	9/10	Canada		112.00						112.00
Commercial airfare							1,930.83				1,930.83
Visit to England, September 17–21, 2010: Hon. Trent Franks	9/17	9/21	England		860.00						860.00
Commercial transportation							915.20				915.20
Kari Bingen Tytler			England		860.00						860.00
Commercial transportation							915.20				915.20
Visit to Japan, September 25–29, 2010: Robert DeGrasse	9/26	9/29	Japan		1,383.00						1,383.00
Commercial transportation	9/26	9/29	Japan		1,383.00		11,705.30				11,705.30
Kari Bingen Tytler							12,169.30				1,383.00
Commercial transportation											12,169.30
Committee total					16,853.61		169,278.33				186,131.94

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. IKE SKELTON, Chairman, Nov. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Teri Gullo	7/03	7/04	Senegal		241.00		(³)				241.00
	7/04	7/06	Liberia		414.00		(³)				414.00
	7/06	7/09	Kenya		986.00		(³)				986.00
	7/09	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(³)				448.00
	7/11	7/13	Mali		746.00		(³)				746.00
	7/13	7/14	United States				3,783.40				3,783.40
Hon. Cynthia Lummis	9/01	9/02	Malta		54.00		(³)		194.00		248.00
	9/02	9/02	Lebanon				(³)				0.00
	9/02	9/04	Pakistan		80.00		(³)				80.00
	9/04	9/05	Afghanistan		15.00		(³)				15.00
	9/05	9/07	Georgia		98.00		(³)		487.82		585.82
Committee total					3,082.00		3,783.40		681.82		7,547.22

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., Chairman, Oct. 28, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. GEORGE MILLER, Chairman, Oct. 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tammy Baldwin	8/03	8/04	Israel		466.00						466.00
	8/05	8/06	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	8/06	8/07	Germany		176.25						176.25
Hon. Joe Barton	8/03	8/04	Israel		466.00						466.00
	8/05	8/06	Afghanistan		6.00		(³)				6.00
	8/06	8/07	Germany		148.25						148.25
David Covicke	8/03	8/05	Israel		780.80						780.80
Military and Commercial Aircraft	8/05	8/07	Germany		432.45		715.99				1,148.44
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	8/28	8/31	China				10,177.90				10,177.90
Committee total					2,503.75		10,893.89				13,397.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN, Chairman, Nov. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Stephane LeBouder	8/6	8/8	Colombia		702.67		(³)				702.67
Hon. Andre Carson	8/3	8/4	Israel		466.00		(³)				466.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		176.25		(³)				176.25
Committee total					1,372.92						1,372.92

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. BARNEY FRANK, Chairman, Oct. 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Paul Berkowitz	7/30	8/1	Germany		559.84		(³)				559.84
	8/1	8/2	India		303.75		(³)				303.75
	8/2	8/5	Thailand		569.00		(³)				569.00
	8/5	8/6	Austria		370.90		(³)				370.90
Dan Bob	7/4	7/6	Philippines		474.00						474.00
	7/6	7/8	Korea		700.00						700.00
	7/8	7/12	Japan		1,724.00						1,724.00
Genell Brown	8/17	8/18	Gabon		0.00		(³)				0.00
	8/18	8/19	Uganda		234.00		(³)				234.00
	8/19	8/21	Ghana		857.00		(³)				857.00
Hon. Dan Burton	8/30	9/1	Serbia		712.00		(³)				712.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00		(³)				762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		1,332.20		(³)				1,332.20
Joan Condon	8/2	8/4	Ghana		509.00						509.00
	8/4	8/7	Guinea		442.00						442.00
	8/7	8/10	Senegal		894.00						894.00
Hon. Bill Delahunt	8/25	8/26	Canada		546.02						546.02
	8/30	9/1	Serbia		712.00		(³)				712.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00		(³)				762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		1,332.20		(³)				1,332.20
Hon. Eliot L. Engel	8/6	8/8	Colombia		702.67		(³)				702.67
Hon. Eni F. H. Faleomavaega	8/24	8/27	Vietnam		763.89						763.89
	8/27	8/28	Japan		187.00						187.00
Hon. Jeff Flake	8/30	9/1	Serbia		712.00		(³)				712.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00		(³)				762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		1,332.20		(³)				1,332.20
Brian Forni	8/30	9/1	Serbia		712.00		(³)				712.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00		(³)				762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		1,332.20		(³)				1,332.20
Guillermina Garcia	8/22	8/29	Colombia		2,029.00						2,029.00
							4,363.25				3,663.25
Daniel Harsha	7/4	7/8	Malaysia		646.00						646.00
	7/8	7/12	Cambodia		657.00						657.00
Hon. Bob Inglis	8/17	8/18	Gabon		0.00		(³)				0.00
	8/18	8/19	Uganda		264.00		(³)				264.00
	8/19	8/21	Ghana		932.00		(³)				932.00
Kristin Jackson	8/6	8/10	Colombia		1,405.34		(³)				1,405.34
	8/10	8/13	Ecuador		718.00						718.00
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	7/6	7/7	Germany		61.25		(³)				61.25
	7/7	7/8	Afghanistan		10.00		(³)				10.00
	7/8	7/9	Germany		97.00		(³)				97.00
	8/17	8/18	Gabon		0.00		(³)				0.00
	8/18	8/19	Uganda		248.00		(³)				248.00
	8/19	8/21	Ghana		752.00		(³)				752.00
Eric Jacobstein	8/6	8/10	Colombia		1,405.34		(³)				1,405.34

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	8/10	8/13	Ecuador		718.00						718.00
Janice Kaguyutan	7/4	7/8	Malaysia		612.00		⁵ 1,166.92				1,166.92
	7/8	7/12	Cambodia		752.00						752.00
	8/22	8/29	Colombia		2,029.00		⁴ 11,653.30				11,653.30
Hon. Ron Klein	8/3	8/4	Israel		466.00						466.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00		⁽³⁾				28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		176.25		⁽³⁾				176.25
Jessica Lee	7/4	7/8	Malaysia		732.00						732.00
	7/8	7/12	Cambodia		752.00						752.00
							⁴ 11,563.00				11,563.00
Vili Lei	8/29	9/1	India		958.00						958.00
	9/1	9/5	Thailand		842.00						842.00
							⁴ 7,891.80				7,891.80
Hon. Connie Mack	8/24	8/27	Vietnam		763.89						763.89
	8/27	8/28	Japan		169.23						169.23
							⁴ 14,250.20				14,250.20
Alan Makovsky	8/6	8/7	Colombia		453.33		⁽³⁾				453.33
							³ 648.00				648.00
	7/30	8/2	Greece		900.00						900.00
Robert Marcus	8/2	8/6	Egypt		1,068.00						1,068.00
	8/6	8/7	Cyprus		240.00						240.00
							⁴ 7,660.50				7,660.50
Hon. Gregory W. Meeks	8/16	8/20	Morocco		789.00						789.00
							⁵ 5,032.90				5,032.90
	8/16	8/22	Morocco		702.67		⁽³⁾				702.67
Thomas Omestad	9/27	9/28	Kuwait		353.06						353.06
	9/28	9/30	Iraq		0.00		⁽³⁾				0.00
							13,585.70				13,585.70
Hon. Donald M. Payne	9/27	9/28	Kuwait		337.06						337.06
	9/28	9/30	Iraq		0.00		⁽³⁾				0.00
							⁵ 13,585.70				13,585.70
Peter Quilter	7/3	7/5	Rwanda		0.00						0.00
							⁷ 8,626.80				8,626.80
	9/7	9/10	El Salvador		593.00						593.00
Jacqueline Quinones	7/6	7/8	Switzerland		834.00		⁴ 1,526.56				1,526.56
							⁴ 947.30		⁶ 1,115.00		1,949.00
											947.30
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	7/31	8/4	Ghana		762.00						762.00
	8/4	8/7	Guinea		433.50						433.50
	8/7	8/10	Senegal		919.00						919.00
Hon. Edward R. Royce	9/27	9/28	Kuwait		355.06						355.06
	9/28	9/30	Iraq		0.00		⁽³⁾				0.00
							⁴ 13,550.70				13,550.70
Julie Schoenthaler	7/30	8/1	Germany		559.84		⁽³⁾				559.84
	8/1	8/2	India		293.75		⁽³⁾				293.75
	8/2	8/5	Thailand		574.00		⁽³⁾				574.00
Hon. Albio Sires	8/5	8/6	Austria		370.90		⁽³⁾				370.90
	8/24	8/25	Canada		286.00						286.00
							⁴ 2,990.83				2,990.83
Daniel Silverberg	8/6	8/8	Colombia		695.67		⁽³⁾				695.67
	7/6	7/8	Yemen		458.00						458.00
	7/8	7/9	Lebanon		294.00						294.00
Hon. Amanda Sloat							⁴ 12,077.90				12,077.90
	8/6	8/8	Columbia		702.67		⁽³⁾				702.67
	6/2	6/6	Bosnia		558.00						558.00
Mark Walker							⁴ 1,535.20				1,535.20
	7/3	7/6	Iceland		596.00						596.00
	7/6	7/7	Norway		329.00						329.00
Robyn Wapner	7/7	7/11	Sweden		998.00						998.00
							⁴ 2,856.30				2,856.30
	7/31	8/4	Ghana		762.00						762.00
Lisa Williams	8/4	8/7	Guinea		438.00						438.00
	8/7	8/10	Senegal		899.00						899.00
							⁴ 6,584.44				6,584.44
Shanna Winters	9/1	9/3	Uzbekistan		268.00						268.00
	9/3	9/9	Kyrgyzstan		1,487.83						1,487.83
							⁴ 12,130.95				12,130.95
Brent Woolfork	8/30	9/1	Serbia		712.00		⁽³⁾				712.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00		⁽³⁾				762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		1,320.60		⁽³⁾				1,320.60
Lisa Williams	8/6	8/10	Columbia		1,361.34		⁽³⁾				1,361.34
							⁵ 1,327.90				1,327.90
	8/24	8/27	Vietnam		763.89						763.89
Shanna Winters	8/27	8/28	Japan		169.23						169.23
							⁴ 14,250.20				14,250.20
	7/6	7/8	Switzerland		836.00				⁶ 1,115.00		1,951.00
Brent Woolfork							⁴ 947.30				947.30
	7/4	7/6	Iceland		601.00						601.00
	7/6	7/7	Norway		314.00						314.00
Mark Walker	7/7	7/10	Sweden		1,038.00						1,038.00
							⁴ 4,028.00				4,028.00
	8/29	9/1	Turkmenistan		127.00						127.00
Mark Walker	9/1	9/3	Uzbekistan		277.00						277.00
	9/3	9/9	Kyrgyzstan		1,517.83						1,517.83
							⁴ 10,241.76				10,241.76
Committee total					69,387.20		249,561.98		2,230.00		321,179.18

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Round-trip airfare.⁵ Return airfare.⁶ Indicates delegation costs.⁷ One-way airfare.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Henry Brown	8/17	8/18	Gabon				(³)				
	8/18	8/19	Uganda		103.00		(³)				103.00
	8/19	8/21	Ghana		282.00		(³)				282.00
Committee total					385.00						385.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II, Chairman, Oct. 6, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Andrew Wright	8/16	8/19	United Kingdom		1,239.00		784.00				2,023.00
Boris Maguire	8/12	8/15	Kyrgyzstan		1,122.48		7,646.90				8,769.38
	8/15	8/19	United Kingdom		1,652.00						1,652.00
Thoms Alexander	8/22	8/15	Kyrgyzstan		1,122.48		7,649.90				8,772.38
	8/15	8/19	United Kingdom		1,652.00						1,652.00
Christopher Bright	8/12	8/15	Kyrgyzstan		1,122.48		7,646.90				8,769.38
	8/15	8/19	United Kingdom		1,641.00						1,641.00
Scott Lindsay	8/12	8/15	Kyrgyzstan		1,122.48		7,646.90				8,769.38
	8/15	8/19	United Kingdom		1,652.00						1,652.00
Other Delegation Costs: United Kingdom									3,937.66		3,937.66
Michael McCarthy	8/3	8/4	Israel		466.00		(3)				466.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		176.25						176.25
Sharon Boyl	8/3	8/4	Israel		421.00		(3)				421.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		176.25						176.25
Steven Rangel	8/3	8/4	Israel		448.00		(3)				488.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		34.25						34.25
Hon. Edolphus Towns	8/3	8/4	Israel		466.00		(3)				466.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		176.25						176.25
Other Delegation Costs: Israel									8,214.63		8,214.63
Jenny Rosenberg	8/3	8/5	Israel		817.00		(3)				817.00
	8/5	8/7	Germany		514.25						514.25
Hon. Peter Welch	9/1	9/2	Malta		179.39		(3)				179.39
	9/2	9/2	Lebanon		0.00						
	9/3	9/4	Pakistan		48.00						48.00
	9/4	9/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	9/5	9/7	Georgia		906.72						906.72
Ryan Dwyer	8/30	9/1	Serbia		712.00		(3)				712.00
	9/1	9/3	Montenegro		762.00						762.00
	9/3	9/6	Croatia		1,332.20						1,332.20
Hon. Bill Shuster	8/22	8/23	Jordan		493.00		6,564.69				7,057.69
	8/23	8/24	Iraq		0.00						
	8/24	8/26	Dubai		548.00						548.00
	8/26	8/27	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	8/28	8/30	Israel		466.00						466.00
Committee total				2,476.00	19,160.48		37,939.29		12,152.29		71,728.06

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS, Chairman, Nov. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Lincoln Diaz-Balart	7/01	7/05	Poland		1,319.07				108.50		1,427.57
	8/06	8/08	Colombia		802.67						802.67
	8/08	8/08	Panama				646.70				646.70
Committee total					2,121.74		646.70		108.50		2,876.94

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER, Chairwoman, Oct. 19, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart	7/01	7/05	Poland		1,319.07		(³)				1,319.07
	8/06	8/08	Colombia		674.67		(³)				674.67
Hon. Bart Gordon	7/08	7/10	United Kingdom		663.00		1,527.40				2,190.40
	7/10	7/13	Belgium		842.00						842.00
Bess Caughran	7/08	7/10	United Kingdom		796.00		1,962.40				2,758.40
	7/10	7/16	Belgium		1,974.00						1,974.00
Delegation Expenses—Belgium									34.23		34.23

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation Expenses—United Kingdom									(⁴)		
Hon. Brian Baird	8/01	8/02	India		486.00		7,857.20				8,343.20
	8/02	8/06	Bhutan		1,120.00		787.40				1,907.40
	8/06	8/08	India		972.00						972.00
Christopher King	8/01	8/02	India		486.00		7,857.20				8,343.20
	8/02	8/06	Bhutan		1,120.00		787.40				1,907.40
	8/06	8/08	India		972.00						972.00
Delegation Expenses—India									724.22		724.22
Delegation Expenses—Bhutan											
Hon. Brian Baird	8/22	8/23	Jordan		493.00		6,987.69				7,480.69
	8/23	8/24	Iraq				(³)				
	8/24	8/26	Dubai		826.00		(³)				826.00
	8/26	8/27	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	8/28	8/30	Israel		932.00		(³)				932.00
Hon. Robert Inglis	8/22	8/23	Jordan		491.00		3,469.59				3,960.59
	8/23	8/24	Iraq				(³)				
	8/24	8/26	Dubai		713.75		(³)				713.75
	8/26	8/27	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	8/28	8/30	Israel		754.00						754.00
Delegation Expenses—Jordan									1,165.80		1,165.80
Delegation Expenses—Israel									7,632.36		7,632.36
Delegation Expenses—Dubai									(⁴)		
Committee total					15,690.49		31,236.28		9,556.61		56,483.38

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Not yet received.

HON. BART GORDON, Chairman, Nov. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARD OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ZOE LOFGREN, Chairman, Oct. 19, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jean Schmidt	8/6	8/8	Columbia		1,818.40		(³)				1,818.40
Hon. Shelley Moore Capito	7/5	7/6	Germany		54.00		(³)				54.00
	7/6	7/7	Afghanistan		164.00		(³)				164.00
	7/8	7/9	Germany		54.00		(³)				54.00
Hon. Mark Schauer	7/5	7/6	Germany		54.00		(³)				54.00
	7/6	7/7	Afghanistan		164.00		(³)				164.00
	7/8	7/9	Germany		54.00		(³)				54.00
Hon. Steve Kagen	8/3	8/4	Israel		466.00		(³)				466.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	8/6	8/7	Germany		176.25		(³)				176.25
Committee total					3,032.65						3,032.65

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Chairman, Oct. 28, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB FILNER, Chairman, Oct. 12, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brian Morrison	7/04	7/06	S.E. Asia		466.00						
	7/06	7/08	S.E. Asia		366.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,903.60				12,735.60
Iram Ali	7/03	7/05	S.E. Asia		466.00						
	7/06	7/08	S.E. Asia		366.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,903.60				12,735.60
Chelsey Campbell	7/03	7/05	S.E. Asia		466.00						
Commercial aircraft	7/06	7/08	S.E. Asia		366.00						
							11,903.60				12,735.60
Mark Young	7/03	7/04	Africa		286.00						
	7/04	7/05	Africa		250.00						
	7/06	7/08	Africa		1,016.00						
	7/08	7/09	Africa		271.00						
Commercial aircraft							6,593.90				8,416.90
George Papaps	7/03	7/04	Africa		286.00						
	7/04	7/05	Africa		250.00						
	7/06	7/08	Africa		1,016.00						
	7/08	7/09	Africa		271.00						
Commercial aircraft							6,593.90				8,416.90
Jay Hulings	7/05	7/07	Europe		326.78						
	7/07	7/09	Middle East		862.00						
Commercial aircraft							2,616.49				3,805.27
Abbas Ravjani	7/05	7/07	Europe		326.78						
	7/07	7/09	Middle East		862.00						
Commercial aircraft							2,626.49				3,805.27
Nate Hauser	7/05	7/07	Europe		326.78						
	7/07	7/10	Middle East		862.00						
Commercial Aircraft							2,616.49				3,805.27
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	8/01	8/02	S.E. Asia		331.10						
	8/03	8/05	S.E. Asia		611.21						
	8/06	8/09	Europe		364.68						
	7/30	7/31	Europe		435.00		(³)				1,741.89
Bob Minehart	8/01	8/02	S.E. Asia		331.10						
	8/03	8/05	S.E. Asia		611.21						
	8/05	8/06	Europe		364.68						
	7/30	7/31	Europe		435.00		(³)				1,741.89
Carly Scott	8/01	8/02	S.E. Asia		331.10						
	8/03	8/05	S.E. Asia		611.21						
	8/05	8/06	Europe		364.38						
	7/30	7/31	Europe		435.00		(³)				1,741.89
Frank Garcia	8/1	8/2	S.E. Asia		331.10						
	8/3	8/5	S.E. Asia		611.21						
	8/5	8/6	Europe		364.68						
	7/30	7/31	Europe		435.00		(³)				1,741.89
Mike Delaney	8/2	8/4	Europe		913.66						
	8/4	8/5	Europe		126.00						
	8/5	8/7	Europe		210.00						
Commercial aircraft							4,455.20				5,704.86
Brian Morrison	8/2	8/4	Europe		913.66						
	8/4	8/5	Europe		126.00						
	8/5	8/7	Europe		210.00						
Commercial aircraft							5,407.20				6,656.86
Chelsey Campbell	8/2	8/4	Europe		913.66						
	8/4	8/5	Europe		126.00						
	8/5	8/7	Europe		210.00						
Commercial aircraft							5,407.20				6,656.86
Jay Hulings	8/1	8/3	Europe		734.00						
	8/3	8/5	Europe		494.85						
	8/5	8/6	Europe		640.00						
Commercial aircraft							4,989.70				6,858.55
Adam Lurie	8/1	8/3	Europe		734.00						
	8/3	8/5	Europe		494.85						
	8/5	8/6	Europe		640.00						
Commercial aircraft							4,989.70				6,858.55
Fred Fleitz	8/1	8/3	Europe		734.00						
	8/3	8/5	Europe		494.85						
	8/5	8/6	Europe		640.00						
Commercial aircraft							4,989.70				6,858.55
Hon. Mike Conaway	8/5	8/7	Asia		632.00						
Commercial aircraft							4,580.90				5,212.90
James Lewis	8/5	8/7	Asia		632.00						
Commercial aircraft							10,334.70				10,966.70
Larry Hanauer	8/8	8/10	Asia		958.00						
	8/10	8/11	Asia		632.00						
	8/11	8/13	Asia		443.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,603.60				16,636.60
Linda Cohen	8/08	8/10	Asia		958.00						
	8/10	8/11	Asia		632.00						
	8/11	8/14	Asia		443.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,603.60				16,636.60
Abbas Ravjani	8/08	8/10	Asia		958.00						
	8/10	8/11	Asia		632.00						
	8/11	8/14	Asia		443.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,603.60				16,636.60
Catherine McElroy	8/08	8/10	Asia		958.00						
	8/10	8/11	Asia		632.00						
	8/11	8/14	Asia		443.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,603.60				16,636.60
Nate Hauser	8/08	8/10	Asia		958.00						
	8/10	8/11	Asia		632.00						
	8/11	8/14	Asia		443.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,603.90				16,636.60
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	8/23	8/25	Latin America		793.39						
	8/26	8/29	Latin America		1,077.69						
	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
Commercial aircraft							(³)				2,245.08
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	8/23	8/25	Latin America		793.39						
	8/26	8/29	Latin America		1,077.69						
	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
Commercial aircraft							(³)				2,245.08
Mike Delaney	8/23	8/25	Latin America		793.39						
	8/26	8/29	Latin America		1,077.69						
	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
Commercial aircraft							(³)				2,245.08
Iram Ali	8/23	8/25	Latin America		93.00						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Courtney Littig	8/26	8/29	Latin America		355.00						
	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
	8/23	8/25	Latin America		93.00		(³)				2,245.08
	8/26	8/29	Latin America		355.00						
Stephanie Leaman	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
	8/23	8/25	Latin America		793.39		(³)				2,245.08
	8/26	8/29	Latin America		1,077.69						
	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
Ashley Lowry	8/23	8/25	Latin America		793.39		(³)				2,245.08
	8/26	8/29	Latin America		1,077.69						
	8/29	8/30	Latin America		374.00						
Stacey Dixon	8/23	8/25	Europe		534.90						
	8/26	8/27	Europe		374.00						
	8/28	8/30	Europe		202.00						
Commercial aircraft							3,387.50				4,498.40
Carly Scott	8/23	8/25	Europe		534.90						
	8/26	8/27	Europe		374.00						
	8/28	8/30	Europe		202.00						
Commercial aircraft							3,387.50				4,498.40
Catherine McElory	8/23	8/25	Europe		534.90						
	8/26	8/27	Europe		374.00						
	8/28	8/30	Europe		202.00						
Commercial aircraft							3,387.50				4,498.40
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	8/27	8/28	Asia		470.00						
	8/28	8/29	S.E. Asia		156.52						
	8/29	8/30	S.E. Asia		233.00						
	8/30	8/31	S.E. Asia		183.00						
	8/31	9/01	S.E. Asia		662.25						
	9/2	9/3	S.E. Asia		367.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,547.20				13,618.97
James Lewis	8/27	8/28	Asia		470.00						
	8/28	8/29	S.E. Asia		156.52						
	8/29	8/30	S.E. Asia		233.00						
	8/30	8/31	S.E. Asia		183.00						
	8/31	9/01	S.E. Asia		662.25						
	9/2	9/3	S.E. Asia		367.00						
Commercial aircraft							8,123.70				10,195.47
Sarah Geffroy	8/26	8/28	Asia		470.00						
	8/28	8/29	S.E. Asia		156.52						
	8/29	8/30	S.E. Asia		233.00						
	8/30	8/31	S.E. Asia		183.00						
	8/31	9/2	S.E. Asia		622.25						
	9/2	9/3	S.E. Asia		367.00						
Commercial aircraft							8,757.50				10,789.27
Hon. Jeff Miller	8/30	9/05	S.E. Asia		1,185.00						
Commercial aircraft							7,551.50				8,736.50
George Pappas	8/30	9/05	S.E. Asia		1,185.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,575.90				15,760.90
Jay Hulings	8/30	9/05	S.E. Asia		1,185.00						
Commercial aircraft							15,877.90				17,062.90
Hon. Jeff Miller	8/30	9/05	S.E. Asia		1,185.00						
Commercial aircraft							7,551.50				8,736.50
George Pappas	8/30	9/05	S.E. Asia		1,185.00						
Commercial aircraft							14,575.90				15,760.90
Jay Hulings	8/30	9/05	S.E. Asia		1,185.00						
Commercial aircraft							15,877.90				17,062.90
Mac Thornberry	9/01	9/03	Europe		367.00						
	9/03	9/04	Africa		346.86						
	9/04	9/06	Africa		392.65						
Commercial aircraft							5,856.20				6,962.71
Chris Donesa	9/01	9/03	Europe		367.00						
	9/03	9/04	Africa		346.86						
	9/04	9/06	Africa		392.65						
Commercial aircraft							5,856.20				6,962.71
Stacey Dixon	9/01	9/03	Europe		367.00						
	9/03	9/04	Africa		346.86						
	9/04	9/06	Africa		392.65						
Commercial aircraft							5,926.90				7,033.41
Hon. Rush Holt	9/05	9/06	Middle East		292.00						
Commercial aircraft							6,307.00				6,599.00
Mark Young	9/05	9/06	Middle East		292.00						
Commercial aircraft							6,307.00				6,599.00
Fred Fleitz	9/05	9/06	Middle East		292.00						
Commercial aircraft							6,307.00				6,599.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	9/9	9/10	Europe		416.00						
	9/10	9/11	Europe		617.71						
	9/11	9/12	Europe		234.00						
	9/12	9/13	Europe		300.50						
	9/13	9/14	Europe		243.31						
Commercial aircraft							3,167.80				4,979.32
James Lewis	9/9	9/10	Europe		416.00						
	9/10	9/11	Europe		617.71						
	9/11	9/12	Europe		234.00						
	9/12	9/13	Europe		300.50						
	9/13	9/14	Europe		243.31						
Commercial aircraft							2,686.60				4,498.12
Chelsey Campbell	9/9	9/10	Europe		416.00						
	9/10	9/11	Europe		617.71						
	9/11	9/12	Europe		234.00						
	9/12	9/13	Europe		300.50						
	9/13	9/14	Europe		243.31						
Commercial aircraft							2,686.60				4,498.12
In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which the Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.											
Committee total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Alex Johnson	7/27	7/30	Austria		948.00		1,100.20				2,048.20
Committee total					948.00		1,100.20				2,048.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Oct. 19, 2010.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 6419, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 6419, EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CONTINUATION ACT AS AMENDED

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2011–2015	2011–2020
NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT												
Total Changes	12,115	69	90	92	68	37	26	4	0	0	12,435	12,502
Less:												
Designated as Emergency Requirement ^a	12,115	69	90	92	68	37	26	4	0	0	12,435	12,502
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Memorandum: Components of the Emergency Designation: ^b												
Change in Outlays	12,115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,115	12,115
Changes in Revenues	0	-69	-90	-92	-68	-37	-26	-4	0	0	-320	-387

^a Section 5 of H.R. 6419 would designate the act as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.^b For outlays, a positive number indicates an increase in the deficit. For revenues, a negative number indicates an increase in the deficit.

Notes: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

H.R. 6419 would extend Emergency Unemployment Compensation and full federal funding of extended benefits through February 28, 2011. The bill also would allow states to calculate the extended benefits triggers using a three-year look-back for the period of the extension.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10390. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flubendiamide; Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0099; FRL-8849-2] received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10391. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0781; FRL-8850-3] received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10392. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Captain Philip G. Howe, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of rear admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10393. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account", for the period ending September 30, 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10394. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Prohibition on Interrogation of Detainees by Contractor Personnel (DFARS Case 2010-D027)

(RIN: 0750-AG88) received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10395. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Trade Agreements-New Thresholds (DFARS 2009-D040) (RIN: 0750-AG59) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 48th report required by the FY 2000 Emergency Supplemental Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10397. A letter from the Vice President of the United States, transmitting November 2010 Update to the National Defense Authorization Act of FY 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10398. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Equal Access to Justice Act Implementation (RIN: 2590-AA29) received November 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0740; FRL-9221-6] received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10400. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction declared by Executive Order 12938 on November 14, 1994, as amended, is to continue in effect beyond November

14, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 111-153); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

10401. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the report on compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10402. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6B for Fiscal Years 2008 Through 2010, as of March 31, 2010", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10403. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled "Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6D for Fiscal Years 2008 Through 2010, as of March 31, 2010", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10404. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled "Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A for Fiscal Years 2008 Through 2010, as of March 31, 2010", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10405. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals for the 1st and 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2010", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10406. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's "Major" final rule — Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program: Miscellaneous Changes, Clarifications, and Corrections (RIN: 3206-AG63) received November 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10407. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Pequonnock River, Bridgeport, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0787] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10408. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Swim Events within the Sector New York Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0502] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10409. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Raccoon Creek, Bridgeport, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0743] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10410. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Wheeling, WV, Wheeling Heritage Port Sternwheel Foundation fireworks display [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0723] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10411. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ocean City Beachfront Air Show, Ocean City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0817] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10412. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Part A Premiums for CY 2011 for the Uninsured Aged and for Certain Disabled Individuals Who Have Exhausted Other Entitlement [CMS-8041-N] (RIN: 0938-AP85) received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10413. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's fourth fiscal year 2010 quarterly report on unobligated and unexpended appropriated funds; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

10414. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Hospital Deductible and Hospital and Extended Care Services Coinsurance Amounts for CY 2011 [CMS-8040-N] (RIN: 0938-AP86) received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

10415. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Part B Monthly Actuarial Rates, Premium Rate, and Annual Deductible Beginning Jan-

uary 1, 2011 [CMS-8042-N] (RIN: 0938-AP81) received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

10416. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Home Health Prospective Payment System Rate Update for Calendar Year 2011; Changes in Certification Requirements for Home Health Agencies and Hospices [CMS-1510-F] (RIN: 0938-AP88) received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

10417. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Payment Policies Under the Physician Fee Schedule and Other Revisions to Part B for CY 2011 [CMS-1503-FC] (RIN: 0938-AP79) received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

10418. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System and CY 2011 Payment Rates; Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment System and CY 2011 Payment Rates; Payments to Hospitals for Graduate Medical Education Costs; Physician Self-Referral Rules and Related Changes to Provider Agreement Regulations; Payment for Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist Services Furnished in Rural Hospitals and Critical Access Hospitals [CMS-1504-FC and CMS-1498-IFC2] (RIN: 0938-AP82 and RIN: 0938-AP80) received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 5866. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 requiring the Secretary of Energy to carry out initiatives to advance innovation in nuclear energy technologies, to make nuclear energy systems more competitive, to increase efficiency and safety of civilian nuclear power, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5498. A bill to enhance homeland security by improving efforts to prevent, deter, prepare for, detect, attribute, respond to, and recover from an attack with a weapon of mass destruction, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-659, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select) discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5498 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 5498. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than December 3, 2010.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SIRE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 6425. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 6426. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs and activities for connecting children and families with the outdoors; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 6427. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an update under the Medicare physician fee schedule through 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6428. A bill to exclude from gross income compensation provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company for victims of the natural gas transmission line explosion occurring in San Bruno, California, and to treat as nontaxable any gain from the involuntary conversion of their property as the result of such explosion, without regard to the rules requiring conversion to property of a similar use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 6429. A bill to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 until February 29, 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MINNICK:

H.R. 6430. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve educational assistance for veterans who served in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 6431. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the application of chapter 13 with respect to principal residences that are the subject of foreclosure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAO:

H.R. 6432. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAO (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 6433. A bill to impose sanctions on individuals who are complicit in human rights abuses committed against nationals of Vietnam or their family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 6434. A bill to establish programs to aid in the economic, environmental, and public health recovery of the Gulf States from the damage and harm caused by the blowout of the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon and the resulting degradation of the Gulf over time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 6435. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out grant programs to provide low-income students with access to high-quality early education programs that promote school readiness, address the achievement gap for English-language learners, and encourage bilingualism; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 6436. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify the intent of Congress for Federal labor law preemption of State and local law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 6437. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing a maternity care quality measurement program, identifying payment mechanism improvements, and identifying essential evidence-based maternity care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 6438. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status for certain long-term conditional residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 6439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain determinations before the filing of all notices of Federal tax liens and supervisory approval before the filing of certain notices of Federal tax liens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 6440. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to provide an exemption for any person seeking to enter into a shared living arrangement with a person sharing similar re-

ligious opinions or religious beliefs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6441. A bill to improve the safety of motorcoaches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 6442. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent low-income public servants from falling into poverty by modifying the Government Pension Offset to protect their Social Security widows and spousal benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. LEE of New York):

H.R. 6443. A bill to provide for the design, production, and presentation of a Gold Medal of Remembrance to the children of members of the Armed Forces who die while serving on active duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, or Operation New Dawn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 6444. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for appropriate procedures under such title for verification of citizenship status; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 6445. A bill to establish the Carolinas Revolutionary Road National Heritage Area in the States of North Carolina and South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 6446. A bill to authorize the transfer of a naval vessel to the Mackinac Island State Park Commission of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 6447. A bill to eliminate the preferences and special rules for Alaska Native Corporations under the program under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution disapproving the issuance of a letter of offer with respect to a certain proposed sale of defense articles and defense services to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. PITTS):

H. Res. 1725. A resolution condemning and deploring the murderous attacks, bombings, kidnappings, and threats against vulnerable

religious communities in Iraq, in particular the attack against Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad on October 31, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H. Res. 1726. A resolution honoring the service and accomplishments of Kingston Smith, Republican Staff Director and Chief Counsel for the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H. Res. 1727. A resolution recognizing Rotary International for 105 years of service to the world and commending members on their dedication to the mission and principles of their organization; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 1728. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the recognition, protection, promotion, and facilitation of the annual JFK 50 Mile; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H. Res. 1729. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should forthwith take the procedural actions necessary to amend Article 23 of the Charter of the United Nations to establish India as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 1730. A resolution commending Bobby Thomson; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN):

H. Res. 1731. A resolution reaffirming Congressional opposition to the declaration of a Palestinian state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H. Res. 1732. A resolution condemning the unilateral decision of the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to begin the closure of the Yucca Mountain license application review and calling on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to resume license application review activities immediately pending further direction from Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. Res. 1733. A resolution recognizing Mark Twain as one of America's most famous literary icons on the 175th anniversary of his birth and the 100th anniversary of his death; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 988: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 1077: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 1079: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 1408: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 1569: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 1704: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 1835: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2030: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 2066: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 2458: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 3025: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3447: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
 H.R. 3554: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 3652: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 4199: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 4446: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4476: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 4689: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 4690: Mr. WEINER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 4757: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 4844: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 4959: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 5028: Mr. BACA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 5078: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 5141: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 5184: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5233: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 5234: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 5295: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 5447: Mr. OLVER and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 5587: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 5743: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 5789: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 5926: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 5983: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. REYES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CRITZ.
 H. R. 6021: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H. R. 6032: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H. R. 6036: Mr. WU.
 H. R. 6087: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H. R. 6104: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H. R. 6144: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H. R. 6147: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CHU, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H. R. 6192: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. R. 6193: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. R. 6227: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. R. 6240: Mr. SCALISE.
 H. R. 6273: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H. R. 6299: Mr. FILNER.
 H. R. 6308: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H. R. 6355: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. R. 6403: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H. R. 6406: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H. R. 6407: Mr. CAO and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 6408: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 6415: Mr. CAMPBELL.
 H.R. 6416: Mr. JONES and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 6417: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 6419: Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.J. Res. 23: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.J. Res. 77: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.J. Res. 95: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.J. Res. 96: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 110: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 291: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 323: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 1476: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 1523: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H. Res. 1531: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WU, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H. Res. 1534: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. DENT.
 H. Res. 1594: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 1687: Mr. LANCE, Mr. MACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SPACE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. JENKINS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 1696: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Res. 1703: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FALCOMA VEGA.
 H. Res. 1705: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H. Res. 1724: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BUYER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. NYE.